

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—APRIL, 1886.—No. 42.

THE ROMAN QUESTION.

MORE than once, since a recent visit to Italy, we have been asked our opinion of the condition of things in that country, and if what we had seen then had given us any hope of an early restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The questions and the answers we had to give suggested the subject of the present article. In what we have to say we shall draw far less on personal observation than on our reading, and on conversations had with persons better acquainted with Italy than we can pretend to be.

Like all persons who had known Rome before 1870, and who have visited it since that time, we found it much improved, materially. The streets were cleaner than they used to be. New hotels, blocks, and even streets of private residences, in the style of the new Paris boulevards, and large public buildings, had arisen in all directions. Nowhere in Europe had we seen as many soldiers, and especially officers, out of quarters. The streets were filled with them. But though to our unprofessional eye their uniforms were all that could be desired, the men contrasted sadly with the soldierly police, dragoons, and Noble Guard of former days. There was something about them that recalled an anecdote we had heard of the grandfather of the late King of Naples. He had been present at a review of his troops, at which they appeared for the first time in a new uniform. At the close of the manœuvres he

was asked by the general in command what he thought of the men. "You may dress them as you please," replied his majesty; "they will run away."

Many property owners in Rome had, we were told, become pretty well reconciled to the new order of things. The reason of this was that since it had become the capital, real estate had increased threefold in value. The government had brought with it fifty thousand officials and about as many workmen, and these needed house accommodations, and put money in circulation. This was a serious temptation, even to a people as loyal as the Romans had ever been to the Popes, and it is not to be wondered at that some of them should have yielded to it, to the extent of trying to carry water on both shoulders.

The people, in outward bearing at least, seemed as decorous and grave as ever. The churches were as well attended, the smaller ones as crowded with devout worshippers as of old time. Two things only seemed to point to the growth of modern ideas in the Eternal City, the profanation of the Sunday in many places, and an evident falling off in the moral training of the young. Roman boys, even those of tender years, once so modest, can now smoke cigars and swear in the streets with as much ease and self-composure as those of any other city in Europe or America. This was all of evil that was seen on the streets. We were told, however, that in the theatres, and in too many other places, things were done the like of which had not been known in Rome since pagan times. But as nothing of the sort came under our personal observation, we prefer to pass such matters over in silence.

Business was very dull in Rome last May. It always is at that season. But store-keepers told us that even during the previous winter they had done little or nothing. Hotel-keepers had the same complaint to make. Both agreed that as many visitors had come as in previous years, but that they had remained only a short time and spent little. Everybody complained of the taxes, which amounted to over forty per cent. of every man's income or profits. An American physician, who had settled in Rome some years ago, told us he had attempted to practise his profession there last year, but finding that the tax on the profession exceeded any receipts he could reasonably hope for from it, he closed his office.

And, in point of fact, the whole country is overwhelmed by taxation. "There is nothing left us to tax but the air we breathe," said Senator Iacini, Chairman of the Committee of Agricultural Affairs in 1880. "Rural Italy," said this same gentleman last May, "has to bear an accumulation of taxes greater than that of any other nation in the world. We have in this touched the limits of the absurd." One-fourth of the income from land goes in direct

taxes; one-half the remainder goes to those who till it on shares, or a third to those who till it at the expense of the owner. The rest is all, or nearly all, spent in paying personal or other taxes, of which there are some forty-six in Italy. So that Italians nowadays may be said to till the soil for the national, provincial and municipal treasuries. The *Unita Cattolica* of the 27th of last January informs us that the public debt of all the Italian States, before 1860, was about seven hundred and twenty-two millions of francs, and that it is now, under United Italy, eighteen milliards, eight hundred and eighty-two millions! On this is paid a yearly interest of about five hundred millions. The result of all this has been that tens of thousands of holdings have been sold every year for taxes. The *Gazzetta Ufficiale* of April 28th, 1885, puts the number for each year at thirty-four thousand. The occupants of those holdings have been compelled to emigrate, or go to swell the ever-increasing numbers of the dangerous classes. The confiscated church property, valued at two milliards of francs, has nearly all disappeared. One-half of it had been sold as early as 1870. On the fourth of July of that year, Deputy Bartolucci asked the Parliament if the money thus acquired had made them any richer, and if in that instance, too, the old proverb had not been verified, that "the devil's flour turns all to waste"? and added, on the authority of the Minister of Finance, that there remained of it then "only a black spot."

The prison reports of the Italian kingdom show that of late years it has attained a sad primacy in crime among civilized nations. Want and misery are everywhere on the increase; and even in Rome itself, the place most favored by the patronage and prestige of the government, the poor sometimes faint and die in the streets for hunger. Such a thing had never been heard of under the Popes.

There was no city in the world where the poor were as well cared for as in Rome before the advent of its present rulers. From time immemorial every Pope had his almoner residing near him in his palace, whose duty it was to help the needy poor. "There was not in Rome," says Morichini, "a religious association or institution that did not dispense relief, not a convent, or a monastery, that did not give some kind of food, not a noble or wealthy house that had not its fixed assignment for the poor." "It certainly does appear to be a matter next to an impossibility," says John Francis Maguire, in his book on "Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions," "that one should die of starvation in Rome; for not only are the most ample resources applicable to every human want, and to which the poor may have immediate access, to be found there, but there exist all kinds of charitable associations, directed to the

sacred duty of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and comforting the afflicted. Then there are many well-known public institutions always open to the poor person in distress, and from whose doors want and destitution are never driven by surly porters, representing rather the selfishness of the rate-payer than the charity of the Christian."

Nor was this lavish charity allowed to encourage mere vagrancy, for, as Mr. Maguire remarks, "the most rigorous measures have been adopted by successive Popes, from the time of Pius V., in the sixteenth century, to Pius IX., in the nineteenth, to suppress vagrancy and punish imposture." There were also in Rome various societies, whose object it was to seek out the poor who were ashamed to beg, and give them needed assistance, such as the Arch-Confraternity of the Twelve Apostles, the Urbana Congregation, and the Congregation of Divine Mercy. "The first mentioned," says Mr. Maguire, "employs a number of physicians who visit the sick whom the members have found to stand in need of such succour. They also provide professional assistance for the defence of the poor, and they specially protect orphans and widows, and procure a safe shelter for girls in danger. They likewise arrange disputes and reconcile enemies. The Brothers, who are called 'Deputies,' are all of noble or wealthy families." There was also in Rome a society to give employment to the poor, and especially to the aged poor, on the public works, and one of lawyers and persons attached to the *Curia*, called the Society of St. Ivo, to defend them gratis in the courts.

There were asylums for all the orphans of both sexes in the city, where they were educated and taught trades, and from some of which the girls, after they had left and were about to marry, received a modest dower to enable them to go to housekeeping. There were in Rome no less than fourteen establishments of this description. In one of them, St. Michael's, there were, besides a number of old men and old women, about five hundred boys and girls. The boys were taught all trades, and when they displayed particular talent they were instructed by the best masters in music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and all other branches of the liberal arts. The first time we heard Italian opera was at this institution, and those present declared they had never heard it given with better effect than by the fresh young voices they then listened to. The leading tenor on the occasion soon afterwards acquired a European reputation.

Then in Rome, under the Popes, hospitals were so numerous and so well appointed that their accommodation could never be overtaxed. They had special wards, and even special buildings, set apart for different diseases, from the ordinary indisposition to

the malady that is incurable. And there were even institutions to receive convalescents who had left the hospitals, and keep them till their strength was sufficiently restored to enable them to resume their ordinary avocations.

Such was the charity of Rome under the Popes—a charity that taught men to see in the poor and the sick our Lord himself, and to think that what was done to them was done unto Him.

The Piedmontese seized all the institutions founded by this charity in the lapse of ages, and put them under almost exclusively secular management. The result has been that disorder, and more serious abuses than mere disorder, have crept into most of them; their revenues have been wasted by incompetent and dishonest officials, and the poor and the sick and the orphan have been left to suffer. One lamentable instance of this was brought to light last summer. The richest and the largest hospital in Rome was that of *Santo Spirito*. It was founded by Ina, king of the Saxons, about the year 728. It is located in the Leonine city, or *Borgo*, not far from the Vatican palace. The Popes, and especially Pius IX., expended vast sums in enlarging and adorning it, and providing it with all the best appliances which science had introduced for institutions of the kind. In 1870 it had 1680 beds, though the average number of patients was only from six to seven hundred. Its annual revenue was 1,138,678 francs. Of this, 759,539 francs went for the support of the sick and the foundlings of an asylum that was attached to it. Last June Augustus Silvestrelli was appointed director of this institution; but, before definitely accepting the position, he prudently resolved to look into its financial condition. He did so, and in his report to the Hospital Commission of Rome, on the 20th of June, he informed that body that the annual revenue has been reduced from 1,138,678 to 64,018 francs. "This amount," he says, "is not sufficient to maintain even the conservatory, and nothing is left for the foundlings, or for the support of a single patient in the hospital!" "This immense deficit," he adds, "was at first concealed by the seeming regularity of the accounts, but was finally discovered; and now the true condition of things should be made known to everybody." And thus fifteen years of revolutionary rule sufficed to destroy what it took the Popes centuries to accumulate for the unfortunate in their capital. Some, even, of the radical journals, commenting on this fact, intimated that the same condition of things would be found to exist in only too many of the charitable institutions of the kingdom.

But, even apart from "irregularities" of this sort, the constant drain on charitable institutions, in the form of taxes and expenses of administration, is frightful. In 1878 the assets of these institu-

tions, in all Italy, amounted to 1,626,662,962 francs, with a net annual income of 90,859,521 francs. Of this income, the government took 14,484,332 francs in taxes; 15,062,455 were spent on administration; 14,202,510 went to meet other expenses; so that there remained for the poor but 47,110,223 francs, or only a little more than one-half the income! In view of these facts and figures, it is not to be wondered at that Deputy Sanguinetti should have said in Parliament, March 8th, 1881, that charity in Italy was then organized theft.

The last statement we have seen of the actual condition of things, in the unhappy country, was made by Deputy Romano, in the Parliament, on the 12th December, 1885: "What," he asked, "are the effects of this iliad of sorrows? They are general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, that are the fruit of public wrong; a general struggle for existence, by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government; all the consequences of ill-advising, hunger (*male-sua da fames*), deterioration of character and immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime; smuggling, usury, crimes and suicides, and an increasing discontent that is undermining our institutions and the tranquillity of the state."

And now, as to the temporal power of the Pope. We really do not see any human grounds of hope for its speedy restoration. The Revolution went to Rome, not so much to find a historic or a convenient capital for United Italy, as to destroy the Papacy. One of its most prominent leaders said, on the 26th of March, 1861: "Not by excessive devotion, not by theological teaching, but by the ideas proclaimed by the French Revolution, can we succeed in the so-called Roman question." "These ideas," he added, "are those of the encyclopædists, of Rousseau, of Voltaire, of the free-thinkers, and they can redeem us from the Pontiff." And the radical organ, the *Diritto*, of July 3d, 1863, scouted the illogical and hypocritical promise to respect the spiritual authority of the Pope, after having abolished his temporal power. "Our revolution," it said, August 11th, of the same year, "aims at the destruction of the Catholic Church; it must destroy it; it cannot fail to destroy it. Nationality, unity, political liberty, are means to this end, the total destruction of Catholicity, which it (the Revolution) has much at heart." Other journals, and other distinguished revolutionists, have, time and again, given expression to the same sentiments. In 1870, just before the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome, Mazzini wrote: "The energies of the party must now be

concentrated on Rome, so as to make it impossible for the Papacy to live within its walls." It would be idle, then, to hope that a government that is the creature of the Revolution, and, just now, controlled by its radical Left, will, of its own accord, ever abandon Rome to the Pope. Its adherents have repeatedly declared that, rather than do so, they are prepared to reduce it to a heap of ruins. And this, we are persuaded, was no empty threat.

On the other hand, it is not to be expected that the people of Italy will be able to change or materially modify the present state of things in that country. "The whole electoral body," wrote Cardinal Manning, in 1877, "does not exceed half a million of men. In twenty-six millions there is not so much as a fiftieth part who possess the electoral franchise. . . . Of those five hundred thousand men, two hundred and fifty thousand, that is, one-half, never go to the polls, or record a vote. They are Catholics who, for conscience sake, have from the beginning refrained from voting. They have never voted at all, and that upon these grounds: that if they were to vote, they would recognize the law, they would accept the constitution, they would be partakers in the present state of Rome, and sanction its usurpation. Moreover, any man whom they might elect could not sit in the Chamber without taking the oath that binds him to the Revolution that now holds Italy down, and to the violation of the sovereignty of the Head of the Church. . . . Those two hundred and fifty thousand men are but half of the electoral body, and less than one-hundredth part of the Italian people."

In 1882 there were about 600,000 voters in Italy, but an extension of the franchise, made in that year, increased their number to about 2,500,000 in a population of 28,000,000. Nevertheless, in the general elections of October of the same year, only about a million of votes were cast.

Catholics are permitted, and even urged, to take part in municipal and provincial elections, but, for the reasons mentioned by Cardinal Manning, and because of the positive declaration of the Pope, that it was not *expedient* for them to vote at general elections, they kept away from the polls in October, 1882. Liberal, nominal Catholics, it is true, voted then as on previous occasions of the same kind, but *they* would not give their suffrages to men disposed to favor a restoration of the temporal power.

And, even were all Catholic voters to go to the polls, to-day, in Italy, they would be powerless to return to Parliament a majority of men favorable to such a measure. They are without political organization and training. They are strangers to the arts of the political wire-puller. Their opponents have been schooled to both, in the secret revolutionary societies, and at the point of the

dagger. They have the government and its machinery, and the military power in their hands, and would know well how to prevent the election of a Catholic majority, or, if it were returned, how to declare the election invalid, as they did in Piedmont, in 1857. It is enough to say that, at the municipal elections, in which Catholics are allowed to take part, comparatively few good Catholics are ever returned.

But may we not count on an uprising, at no distant day, of the Catholic masses against the tyrannical oligarchy that now oppresses them? Not at all. As well might you expect a flock of sheep, when driven to the shambles, to turn on their shepherd and his dog. The Italian people have many virtues, natural and supernatural, but courage is not one of them.

Many in Italy, and elsewhere, look to the Revolution itself to bring about a speedy restoration of the temporal power, on the principle that, when things come to the worst, they are likely to mend. The present government, they say, cannot last. The offspring of the Revolution, it will soon be devoured by the monster that gave it birth. The social republic will take its place, and, as this would be incompatible with even the existence of civilized society, a stable government of some sort must follow, a necessary factor of which will be the independent sovereignty of the Pope. This may all be, but, for our part, we cannot see a way to light and order out of the chaos which these persons predict.

The present condition of Italy is sad indeed. Her future is dark and threatening. A crisis in her affairs cannot be far off. But, when the present government shall have been swept away, and an atheistic or social republic shall have taken its place, will the Roman question be any nearer settlement than it is at present? Who can think so that considers the record of the present French republic, which, in satanic hatred of the Church, far surpasses its predecessor of 1793! And, when the republic shall have given place to a dictator, self-appointed, or chosen by a congress of the great powers, will the situation be any better? It is, to say the least, very doubtful. A dictator has power for good, but no less for evil; and dictators have, as a rule, thus far in the world's history, inclined to the latter. Dictators, and absolute rulers generally, have caused more harm to the Church than even anti-Christian republics have been able to do.

In enumerating the causes likely to bring about a restoration of the temporal power, many Catholic writers lay much stress on the probable intervention, to this end, of the European powers. Those writers remind us that no European government has approved the seizure of the Papal territory in 1870; and that leading statesmen, in England and on the continent, and even some of the founders

of Italian unity themselves, have, time and again, asserted that the Roman question is not simply an Italian, but an international question. This is all very true; but we fear the European governments will be only too well pleased to see matters remain as they are in Italy, for long years to come. All those governments are more or less erastian. The non-Catholic governments want no church but a state church, that will be their creature and do their bidding, and take the law from their lips. If the so-called Catholic, but really Febronian, or infidel governments, do not go thus far, it is because they dare not. Certain it is that both Protestant and Catholic governments are ready to do all in their power to hinder, where they cannot wholly destroy, the freedom of the Church. They are, and always have been, especially jealous of Papal authority. If they ever felt any devotion to St. Peter, it was to St. Peter in chains. They might not object to a Pope with a primacy of mere honor, who would leave them the appointment of bishops, pastors and professors, and the bestowal of church benefices, and who would not trouble them with doctrinal decisions, bulls, encyclicals, and the like; but they will never take kindly to one who claims to exercise real, though but spiritual, jurisdiction over any number of their subjects. They are not, then, likely to trouble Italy about putting an end to the present virtual captivity of the Roman Pontiff. So far from this, they rejoice at it. He is not as firmly bound as they would wish to see him, but they are willing to let very-well alone, for the present. Italy is now doing their work for them; and as long as she continues to do it, they will not interfere with her, at least, for sake of the Pope.

But, could the Pope be reconciled to Italy, could he, whilst continuing to exercise his primacy of jurisdiction over Catholics in all lands, become even the first and most favored subject of the Italian King, then, indeed, their non-intervention in the Roman question would soon cease, they would develop a wonderful zeal in upholding the rights of their Catholic subjects, and insist even on the restoration of the temporal power, if there were no other way open to them of putting an end to such an alliance. Short of such a reconciliation, which is impossible, they will never interfere in behalf of the Pope, unless compelled to do so by force of public opinion. When European Catholics rise superior to dynastic disputes and race prejudices, and in their several countries unite in choosing only such representatives as will care for their highest interests at home and abroad, then, and no sooner, can their governments be induced to favor the independence of the Holy See. But, though there are signs of such an awakening, just now, in France, Austria, and Spain, we fear we shall have to wait long for any important results to come of it.

But, though we cannot now see how the temporal power is to be recovered, we should not on this account despair of its restoration. When Rome is in question, we should leave a much wider margin for the direct action of Divine Providence there than in any other place. The temporal power is necessary to the well-being of the Church, and God will give it back, in His own good time and in His own way.

Every legitimate society has a right to freedom. If it have a right to exist, it has a right not to be impeded in seeking the end for which it was organized. If this be true of all societies, it must be eminently so of the Church, which was instituted for the highest and holiest of purposes—the glory of God and the salvation of souls. She has the right to labor for these ends, and, therefore, to use the means necessary to accomplish them. Other societies may change and be changed. They carry within them the seeds of dissolution. Good and beneficial at first, they may, in time, become bad or useless. In such case, the authority under which they were organized can modify or dissolve them. But the Church is immutable. The work she has to do is always, and everywhere, holy and necessary. Her Divine Founder made her a perfect and an independent society. He asked no charter for her from any civil government. For three hundred years she lived and labored and grew, in spite of all the civil governments with which she had been brought in contact. She can do so again; but who will say that fierce and bloody persecution should be her normal condition, or one in which she should acquiesce? No, those centuries of suffering she endured in her early history, were permitted to show that she was divine, that our faith is “the victory that overcometh the world,” and “the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth,” and to encourage her children, who in after times would, here and there, be made to know the bitterness of oppression. Freedom and peace are, to say the least, as necessary to the Church as to civil society, and it is her right, and her duty, to use every means in her power to secure both.

But, unless the Pope be free, the Church cannot be free. No society is free if its central government and executive are, or can be, hindered and hampered in the exercise of their functions, and deprived of the means necessary to discharge them in a proper manner. Such freedom the Pope cannot enjoy, unless he is his own master. If not his own master, his administration must always be, more or less, at the mercy of the government under which he lives. He must, then, be a sovereign. But a sovereign he cannot be without a territory of his own, or, in other words, without temporal power. And here I would remark that the Pope, as a subject, would be more likely to be restricted in his

liberty than anybody else. The reason is, that the civil power has always been most jealous of the spiritual. The Cæsars were so jealous of it that they made themselves chief pontiffs as well as emperors. The Christian Greek emperors constantly interfered in Church matters, and, as far as they could, sought to usurp ecclesiastical authority. The German emperors, and the kings of the middle and later ages, as a rule, did the same. And, at the time of the "Reformation," all the Protestant sovereigns returned, in this respect, to Cæsarism pure and simple. They founded national churches, and took the government of them into their own hands. Queen Victoria is, to-day, supreme head of the Church of England, and every Anglican bishop, before assuming possession of his see, takes the following oath: "I do verily testify and declare that your Majesty is the only supreme governor of this, your realm, in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm; and I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the bishopric of N., and the possessions of the same, entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the imperial crown of this your Majesty's realm . . . so help me God," etc.

There is, then, a good deal of truth in the saying of Odilon Barrot, that "the two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, had been united in Rome that they might be kept separate in the rest of the world."

Non-Catholic sovereigns claim spiritual authority over their subjects as of direct right coming to them from God or from society. The Popes do not claim their temporal sovereignty for its own sake, but as a means to preserve the independence of their spiritual authority, and only to such an extent as is necessary to secure this object. And yet the claim of civil rulers in this matter excites little surprise and no indignation in those who scout that of the Popes as anti-Christian and subversive of popular rights!

The Pope should be free, not only in fact, but in appearance also. And this is another argument, drawn from the infirmity of human nature, in favor of the temporal sovereignty. Good and enlightened Catholics know and feel that whatever may be the political or social position of the Pope, his action in all that relates to faith and morals and the government of the Church will always be true, and just, and impartial. But all Catholics are not good and enlightened. Many, and especially Catholic rulers, would not give him credit for the foresight or the disinterestedness necessary to keep him from bias, even in such matters, were he to become the subject of a particular power. And as to non-Catholic governments having Catholic subjects, we could not of course expect them to do so. "The Pope," said Napoleon I., "is far from

Paris, and this is well; he is not at Madrid or Vienna, and hence we uphold his spiritual authority. At Madrid and Vienna people can say the same. Think you that, if the Pope were at Paris, the Viennese or Spaniards would consent to receive his decisions? It is, then, a fortunate circumstance that he is in old Rome, holding the balance between Catholic sovereigns, bending a little to the strongest, and then standing erect when the strongest becomes an oppressor. The ages have done this, and they have done it well. It is the best and the most beneficent institution for the government of souls; and saying so, I speak not as a bigot, but as a reasonable man."

This wisdom came too late to Napoleon to avert from himself the consequences of his misdeeds in this very matter.

It was, then, to secure the liberty of the Church, and as far as possible to disarm the suspicions of kings and peoples, that, in the good providence of God, the Popes gradually acquired temporal dominion. It came to them by the very best of titles, by the will of the people and the consent of the secular princes, who thought they had a right to bestow it. In the beginning of the eighth century, to go no farther back in tracing the origin of the temporal power, the people of Rome and of Ravenna, pressed on the one side by the Lombards, who sought to enslave them, and on the other abandoned by the Greek emperor, whose subjects they had been, called on the Pontiffs to assume their temporal government and save them from the fate that threatened them. In 749 Ravenna was taken by the barbarians. Rome was saved from their fury by Pepin, King of France, who confirmed the Pope in the temporal power with which the people had already invested him. His claim to it was further strengthened by twelve hundred years of possession, by countless benefactions to his people, to Italy, and to Europe, and by the recognition of all civilized nations up to the present day.

On the 20th September, 1870, the troops of Victor Emmanuel entered Rome through the breach of *Porta Pia*. Twelve days afterwards, whilst the people were still terrorized by the scenes they had passed through, and by the hordes of camp-followers and desperadoes that had followed the army into the city, a *plebiscite* was ordered by the usurping authority to decide for or against the continuance of the temporal power of the Pope. Groups of hired ruffians were posted at all the polls to intimidate unwelcome voters. None came. Only forty-six votes were given for the Pope, and forty thousand for the invaders! This was over-doing matters with a vengeance. Our own ballot-box stuffers would be ashamed of such work.

Why, in February, 1871, four months after this *plebiscite*, fifty-two Roman noblemen published an address to the Catholic asso-

ciations of the world, in which they say of their fellow-citizens that the "immense majority of them have always remained faithful, and, with the help of God, are firmly resolved never to alter their line of conduct. In testimony whereof they call on the history of the past and the facts of the present, unaltered by calumny and passion." In an allocution, delivered on the 16th of the same month, the Pope says: "I am proud of and thank the Romans for their patient endurance of the present trials, especially of such a number holding official appointments, who, for honor, loyalty, and conscience sake, prefer every privation to betrayal of their trust or felony." And, on the 24th July following, the Primary Roman Society for Catholic Interests presented the Holy Father an address expressive of their loyalty to his temporal authority, signed by 27,161 male Roman citizens of full age, the residence of the signer being appended to each name, and this at a season when thousands of the upper classes were absent from the city. Out of forty-six magistrates in the city, only five transferred their allegiance to the new government. In the Finance Department, out of 1439 employees, only 344 took office under it. In the Interior Department, out of fifty-three, only seventeen remained in office. And in the army, out of 586 officers, only fifty-eight retained their positions. The others, though offered the same rank in the Italian army as they had held in that of the Pope, would not accept it. These facts tell us what we should think of the *plebiscite* held by the Piedmontese after the seizure of Rome in 1870. On the first anniversary of that event the young men of Rome, in an address to the Holy Father, said: "Our hearts burned with indignation when we witnessed the impudence of your enemies, who dared to lie on parchment and marble, representing as a vote of the Roman people that ridiculous *plebiscite*, which was nothing but the vote of a horde of immigrants, strangers, public criminals, and the few cowards who allowed themselves to be drawn over by threats and promises. To this atrocious insult we, to-day, the young men of Rome, your children and subjects, come to oppose a solemn profession of fidelity and devotion, unalterable unto death, to your sacred person, and to the invincible rights in virtue of which you are sovereign Pontiff and our only sovereign."

In 1871 was passed the so-called Law of Guarantees, by which it was provided that the Pope should be regarded and treated as the *guest*, not the subject, of the King of Italy. It made his person as inviolable as that of the civil ruler, and assigned him a yearly pension for his support. But these guarantees did not guarantee. They are mere statutes, depending for their permanence on a parliamentary majority. The authority that made can modify or abolish them at pleasure. The late Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mancini, declared, as he had always held, that they are purely

domestic ordinances, in regard to which foreign powers had nothing whatever to say. The liberty of the Church cannot rest on such a basis as this. Nothing less than the social and political independence of the Holy See can insure its permanence.

Then, in point of fact, the Pope has not been free since the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome. Infidel revolutionists, in and out of Parliament, have been allowed to insult him with impunity. Several persons have been brought before the tribunals for having spoken or written in a manner disrespectful to the King. No such effort has been made to uphold the dignity of the Pope. He is obliged to remain in his palace, for his presence in the streets of Rome would certainly lead to disturbance of the public peace. The joy of the people at seeing him could not be restrained, and its manifestation would provoke a counter demonstration by the partisans of the Revolution. Only a few years ago the crowd coming out of St. Peter's, on a festival day, caught sight of him at a window of the Vatican. A spontaneous outburst of joy went up to him from his children as they knelt for his blessing. The authorities were soon alarmed, and in a short time the soldiers from a neighboring guard-house were sent to clear the piazza at the point of the bayonet.

Everybody knows how, on the night of the 20th September, 1881, the procession accompanying the remains of Pius IX. to their last resting place was attacked by a band of ruffians, who insulted and struck the mourners, and threatened to throw the body of the dead Pontiff into the Tiber. Next day one of the radical organs, the *Lega della Democrazia*, commenting on this outrage, said: "They," the remains of the Pope, "were laid in the tomb with hisses. Our hearts echoed those hisses. Pius IX. was a fool. He personified the Catholic Church now become a monstrous folly. We applaud those hisses." We may imagine, then, what a living Pope, hailed by the vivas of his people, would have to expect from such miscreants.

The Pope can receive visitors and deputations, but so may a prisoner in the penitentiary or a servant in a private house. He can write encyclicals, but the government can prevent their circulation; and, in fact, it has on several occasions sequestered the newspapers that published them. It has control of the mails, of the telegraph, and of travel, and may, whenever it pleases, limit or cut off communication between him and Catholics in and out of Italy.

It took possession of the pontifical palace of the Quirinal, the place where the cardinals used to meet for the election of the Pope. It seized all the charitable institutions of the Papal States, and took into its own hands the management of the universities for the higher education of ecclesiastics and seculars. It suppressed the

religious orders, which Pius IX. declared to be his most powerful arm in the government of the Church, and appropriated their property; and by forcing all their religious corporations, even the missionary congregation of the Propaganda, to convert their real estate into depreciated government securities, reduced their revenues some forty per cent., and imperilled the remainder. It thus greatly diminished the means placed by the faithful of all nations at the disposal of the Holy Father for the proper government of the Church. It has refused to recognize acts of episcopal jurisdiction, even in regard to the appointment of pastors when the bishops had not received the royal *placet*; and even when they were permitted to present their Bulls of nomination to the Minister of Worship, they had long to wait before being allowed to exercise their functions. No wonder, then, that Pius IX. declared that he was "under a hostile government," and that his successor has told the world that, in Rome, he is not free to do even acts of charity. This was said in allusion to the outcry raised against him by the revolutionists, last year, for having built a magnificent cholera hospital beside the Vatican, so that he might be able to visit the patients without being obliged to pass through the streets.

Catholics are not opposed to the unity of Italy. Why should they be? They have no sympathy with the little despotisms that ruled there before 1859. Those despotisms were not as bad as the Revolution has painted them, but they were bad enough to make their restoration undesirable to all lovers of rational liberty. They did not rob the Church, but they greatly interfered with her freedom of action, and their fall was but a just retribution for their transgressions in this respect. We desire to see Italy united, prosperous, and great. She has, in her people, in her soil, and in her geographical position, everything that is necessary to make her become such. But such she cannot be, as long as her government antagonizes the religion of her people, despoils the Church, and holds its visible Head in virtual captivity. She can become a great nation without the States of the Church, or, at least, without as much of them as is necessary to secure the political independence of the Pope. The cession of Nice and Savoy to France, in 1860, was not thought to have materially injured the prospects of Sardinia. On the contrary, in the opinion of Victor Emmanuel and his ministers, it improved them, by strengthening the alliance between it and Napoleon III. The restoration—let us say—of the Romagna, to the Pope, would be productive of far more beneficial results to the present kingdom of Italy. It would tranquillize the minds of its people in regard to that which they hold most dear, their faith; it would allay the indignation it has excited in the hearts of Catholics, in every part of the world, and, in time, conciliate their respect, and gain an ally with three hundred millions of willing, loving, spiritual subjects,

the truest and the noblest ally any government can have, and the best friend Italy has known in the past, or can know in the future.

But, we confess, we see no reason whatever to hope that the present rulers of Italy will ever willingly consent to even a partial restoration of territory to the Holy See. They are the Revolution, godless and anti-Christian, and the ruin of their country would be a lesser evil in their eyes than reconciliation with the Church.

How long the present state of things in Italy is likely to endure, nobody can now foresee. Nevertheless, the intimate connection between the temporal power and the freedom of the Church bids us hope for its speedy termination. In his letter of March 26th, 1860, Pius IX. says: "The Catholic Church, founded and instituted by Christ, for the eternal salvation of men, being a perfect society, in virtue of her institutions, must enjoy such freedom as that, in the exercise of her sacred ministry, she may not be subject to any civil power. And as, in order to labor with that necessary freedom, she stands in need of certain privileges and prerogatives, corresponding to the conditions and requirements of the times, Divine Providence, with singular wisdom, disposed that, after the fall of the Roman Empire and its division into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, made by Christ the head and centre of the universal Church, should obtain a temporal principality. In this way, it was wisely arranged by God himself that, amongst the multitude and variety of secular princes, the Supreme Pontiff should enjoy that political independence so necessary to him, in order that he may exercise, throughout the entire world, and without let or hindrance, his spiritual power and jurisdiction. It is easy to understand, therefore, how this principality of the Roman Church, although of its own nature merely temporal, in virtue of its sacred destiny and its being so closely bound up with the supreme interests of Christianity, is invested with a character altogether sacred."

"We recognize," said the four hundred bishops assembled in Rome in 1862, "the civil principality of the Holy See as a necessary appurtenance, and manifestly instituted by the providence of God. Nor do we hesitate to declare that this same civil principality, in the present condition of human affairs, is absolutely requisite for the adequate and free government of the Church and souls. Undoubtedly it behooveth that the Roman Pontiff, head of the universal Church, should not be the subject of any prince, or the *guest* of any, but, seated on his own throne, in his own kingdom, he should, from his very position, be perfectly free to defend the Catholic faith, and rule and govern the entire Christian republic. . . . And, indeed, how could the pastors of the Church, with any security, come together here from all parts of the globe to treat with your Holiness on matters of the gravest importance, if

there were in this city, and in these states, a ruler who might be jealous of their principles, or be himself suspected by, or hostile to, them?"

Such being the necessity of the temporal independence of the Holy See, we must, unless some extraordinary trial be in store for the Church, hope for its restoration, at no distant day, by means we do not now foresee.

The present position of the Pope is nothing new in history. His predecessors have often been honored by the enmity of more formidable tyrants than the actual rulers of Italy. More than fifty times have the Popes been deprived, in whole or in part, of their temporal domain. More often still have they had to take the road to exile from their capital. For seventy years they lived at Avignon, in France. Their absence was always disastrous to Rome, and to Italy; their return, an occasion for hope and joy to their people. And they *did* always return. Their enemies were humbled and chastised, but they triumphed. Adolph Thiers once said: "Whoever eats of the Pope, dies of it." The history of the Church attests the truth of this. Among those who, in recent times, meddled with the Patrimony of St. Peter, was Napoleon I. He annexed the States of the Church to his empire, and soon after signed his abdication, in the very palace of Fontainebleau where he had imprisoned Pius VII. And then came Elba, Waterloo, and St. Helena. His son, Napoleon II., was proclaimed King of Rome, but he did not live to wear a crown. Napoleon III. plotted with Cavour to despoil Pius IX., his benefactor and the godfather of his child, of his northern provinces, and immediately afterwards went to Sedan, Wilhelmshöhe and Chiselhurst, and his son, the scion of a military dynasty, was slaughtered by naked savages in southern Africa. Cavour was cut off in the middle of his ambitious career, and Victor Emmanuel and many others who took part in the spoliation of the last-named Pontiff, met with sudden and unprovided deaths.

And what has been, will be. "The hand of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear." He will know how to defend His Church and humble her enemies. "What God's will is," wrote Louis Veuillot, "we all know. It is what He has always willed, and still wishes, the advancement, the greatness, and glory of His holy and immortal Church. Where Bismarck reigns at present, Henry IV. reigned before; and he set up an anti-Pope, and continued the fight, and thought himself the victor. Gregory VII. died at Salerno, in exile, and courtiers of the emperor were heard to say: 'Hildebrand is the last of his race.' But the emperor died, too, and Hildebrand was resuscitated. How many persecutors of the Church have

died!—how many Popes have been resuscitated! Shed blood, then, make bad laws, enroll soldiers. Decree that good is evil, and evil good. You are but mortal. Christianity is not. Christians are endowed with divine obstinacy; they will resist you, they will use you, they will bury you. They will bury your great statesmen, your victorious generals, your powerful writers. You may reduce the world to ruins, they will continue to live. They will rise out of the ashes, and the heap of ruins you have accumulated will serve for your tomb. The earth laid waste by you will always furnish enough of wood to make a cross, and a spot whereon to plant it. In spite of yourselves, you will have the honor—though you deem it an affront—of bearing aloft the standard of Him that liveth.”

ART AND ARTISTS.

GIORGIO VASARI.

RICHES and art go hand in hand. As a land waxes fat, art flourishes: if not true art, then some more or less skilful pretender.

We have been growing rich, and it is evident that art, or some pretender, has settled among us. The Museum of Art, with its pretentious, and not too artistic, exterior, is as much a feature of every self-respecting city as the Opera House or the Soldiers' Monument. We have a *salon* every day of the year at the art dealers, while the Academy, the Black and White Association, the Rejected, the Etchers' Club, the Water Color Society, give us *salon* after *salon* as the seasons chase each other. There is, too, the loan-collection at the club, or the kirmess; the private view at the palace of the railway prince or the coal-oil potentate, and the very public view at the ever-recurring auction sale of the last bankrupted financier. Every daily paper has an art column, the work of an art reporter, if not of a real art critic; and there are many weeklies whose whole subject is art. Our magazines give us clever wood-cuts, after the best old and new masters, with interesting articles about famous painters and famed paintings. The best English, French, and German art periodicals have special agencies in our large cities: we read the "*Gazette des Beaux Arts*," "*L'Art*,"

"The Portfolio," or, if these be above our means, the "Art Journal," or the "Magazine of Art." From English and American publishers there is a constant supply of "Art Primers," "Lives of Great Artists," "Wonders of Painting." In our schools the art teaching is so general and so thorough that boys and girls think nothing of throwing off a design for a wall paper between tea and bed-time. More than one of our colleges support an "Art School," and a permanent exhibition; and in no well-regulated young ladies' academy is the curriculum looked upon as complete without the "Lectures on Art" to advanced pupils.

Certainly, all this shows a kind of interest in matters of art and in artists. This interest is in itself desirable. Without it we can know little of art; but with it one may not know much. Under the influence of fashion it is easily acquired or affected. Of itself it does not give knowledge, nor does it make taste; and without knowledge and taste there can be no real appreciation of what art is, of its objects, limitations, methods. Nor can the mere looking at paintings, sculptures, or prints, the skimming over of art periodicals, the reading of primers, or of illustrated "Lives," the designing of wall papers, nor even the listening to six lectures in a twelve-month, on "Ancient and Modern Art," supply any one with the means necessary to an intelligent understanding of that most delightful, instructive, elevating, inspiring, refining thing, Art.

The painter, who follows a long and severe course of study in line and color, will in time learn certain principles of beauty. Practice of hand and eye will force these principles on him. But we, who do not draw or paint, how are we to acquire these principles? Not by intuition, surely; nor by revelation. The patient student who has acquired them, is he, therefore, an artist? By no means. As, then, the student, who by practice has acquired much that it is necessary to know, may still be far from having the knowledge and view of art without which one cannot be an artist, so we, who know so much less, cannot rapidly gain from the picture gallery and the primer what will make us, not judges of art, but even true lovers of art. One cannot love what one does not know. All works of art are things of the mind, of the soul—not merely things of the hand. The most skilful manipulator of the brush, the most cunning combiner of colors, cannot create a great painting: he may paint a pretty picture. It is intelligence and feeling that make the artist. Being a thing of the soul, then, art must be an intelligent thing, a thing of laws. What are these laws? The primer does not tell us, nor can we elaborate them from the *salon*. If we try to do this, we are as like to learn lawlessness as law; for, to hang on an exhibition-wall is not to be a work of art. Inasmuch, therefore, as we do not draw or paint, we are shut out

from a certain art knowledge. Can we acquire this knowledge? Yes, to some extent. We may gather it, in part, from the artist, speaking, or writing; we may round our knowledge by continued and careful observation. And the laws of art? These, too, we may learn by reading and observation; but, above all, by thought. Law is a matter of reason; wherefore, we must reason, and reason closely, if we wish thoroughly to know the laws of art.

Formally to reason about what seems such a wholly pleasurable thing as art, would not be attractive to many minds, least of all to immature minds. The method would repel some and confuse others. Before one has done with it, the thin duodecimo volume on æsthetics outweighs an elephantine folio. How, moreover, are we to be certain that our teacher is not misleading us? For, to write on æsthetics no more implies sound principles than does painting a picture imply artistic knowledge or power.

The history of art is the story of the development of the principles and practice of art. This story is the more interesting, and the more useful, inasmuch as it is a connected record of the thoughts, sayings, and doings of the men who successively have aided in developing art. To read the history of art is to follow art from its first weak growth up to its blooming-time, and again down through its sad decay. From naïveté, ignorance, and ugliness, we see it develop simplicity, knowledge, beauty. We see how this was effected: we have learned what art is. There is no more certain way.

Now, a skilful historian may teach us much in a large and general manner, sacrificing many a charming detail, eliminating many an interesting personage. It may be that we shall have enough; it were better if we had more. This more we can get from biography. A well-written, careful story of the life of a great artist gives us a deep insight into art itself. We see not only the artist and his work, we see the work being done; the aims of a great artistic mind, the outside training, the self-education, the method of that mind; the surroundings, trials, obstacles, successes, aiding or impeding the development of that mind;—what are a thousand *salons* to this one story in fitting us to know and appreciate art?

The best help to a knowledge of art, to judgment in art, would surely be a history of art, wherein, tracing its rise and development, we should learn its principles and practice; see them unfold themselves before us; and, at the same time, become intimately acquainted with great artists. With such a history we would start aright in our story of art, or our play with it; if we had already started, and started wrong, we could the more quickly retrace our steps, and strike the right path. Giotto, Angelico, the Frate, Leonardo, Raphael would no longer be mere names to us, but living, speaking teachers.

If we wish to learn something of art in this right way, and not to be mere gadders in galleries, or gabblers about light and shade, tone and perspective, we have an old book, easy to get, wherefrom we can gather, with a deal of instruction and pleasure, sound principles about art, intimate acquaintance with the masters, a view of art from the beginning, and a detailed story of the rise and progress of the great and new modern-art, from its first weak effort up to its strong and glorious perfection. The book which will help us to all these good things is Giorgio Vasari's "Lives of the Painters."

Let us open the "Lives," not to acquaint ourselves with the plan and scope of the work, nor to read here and there a page about Orgagna, or Buffalmaçco, or Ghiberti, or Castagno, but, first of all, to learn who was Vasari. At the end of the "Lives" we shall find his own story, written by himself; and if we know his friends, teachers, fellow-workers, we have only to turn to their "lives" for added detail of his life told in proper time and place.

Giorgio Vasari was born in the year 1512, at Arezzo, a pleasant Tuscan city, lying some fifty miles south and east of Florence: a city proud of its Etruscan ancestry; proud, too, of having given birth to that Mæcenas, who was the friend of Augustus, Virgil, and Horace. Petrarch, Spinello, the painter; Margaritone, the sculptor; Guido, the founder of the modern school of music,—these had not lessened her pride or her fame.

More than a century before Giorgio, his great-grandfather, Lazzaro Vasari, had gained considerable reputation as a painter in Arezzo and the neighborhood. Intimate friend of that Piero della Francesca who was master of perspective, and, for his time, of anatomy, Lazzaro grew in aim and knowledge, and from painting little things well—decorating the trappings of condottieri—he soon advanced to larger and better work in fresco and on glass. In Giorgio's day, Lazzaro's inventions covered more than one chapel wall in Arezzo. Before Lazzaro's day, and, indeed, during and after his day, the Vasari were potters. First at Cortona, afterwards at Arezzo, they copied the ancient Etruscan ware. Giorgio's grandfather, another Giorgio, rediscovered the secret of the old red and black coloring, dug up Etruscan remains, and, while modelling his vases, found time to acquire no mean skill in basso-rilievo.

Still it was not Lazzaro, or his son, who had brought renown to the family, but Lazzaro's sister's son, the great Luca Signorelli. Luca had studied in Lazzaro's house under Piero della Francesca, and with such avail that he went beyond that master in all wherein he was masterly. In knowledge, vigor, daring, Luca

has not been equalled, unless it be by Michel-Angelo. To say that without Luca there would have been no Angelo, might be to say too much; but we can say that in fresco Luca did well all that Angelo did after him; that Angelo was a worker in the spirit of Luca, and with the same views of art; and what is more, that if the "Last Judgment" be Angelo's greatest work, it was great by reason of Luca, and still fell short of Luca. Thirty years before Angelo laid his first brush-stroke on the Sistine wall, Luca had painted the wondrous "Paradise" at Orvieto. There, with perfect skill in composition, with thorough science of perspective and foreshortening, with most powerful rendering of anatomical accuracy in limb, and bone, and muscle, he had combined grace, beauty, power, majesty, terror, in a series of vast and high conceptions not unworthy of Dante's lofty mind.

With the painter's strain in him, it does not surprise us that from his childhood Giorgio was given to drawing; more given to it, indeed, than pleased his good father, Antonio. Not that Antonio did not wish him to draw, and to draw well, but he wished him to know other good things as well as drawing. Signorelli, then an old man, gave Giorgio kind words and encouragement. He wanted no more. Still a child, he began to copy whatever good pictures there were in the churches of Arezzo. Then his father placed him with Guglielmo da Marsiglia, a painter on glass, a man of "active mind and great intelligence," who taught him the first principles of art.

In 1523, when Giorgio was eleven years old, a kinsman of his father, Cardinal Silvio Passerini, of Cortona, on his way to Florence, stopped at Arezzo. Taking Giorgio with him, Antonio went to pay his respects to the great man; and the Cardinal, pleased with the youth's skill in drawing, and with his recitations from the "Æneid," and, no doubt, with his general brightness and frankness, insisted on taking him to Florence. There Giorgio enjoyed great advantages. He was placed in the house of one Messer Niccolo Vespucci, a knight of Rhodes, who lived close by the Ponte Vecchio. For a drawing-master he had no less a man than Michel-Angelo himself, and his other studies he pursued, for two hours each day, in the company of no lesser personages than Ippolito and Alessandro dei Medici, under their tutor Giovanni Bolzani, who, on account of his love for the muses, was called, after the fashion of the time, Pierio.

Giorgio lost no time. He had lost none thus far: he never lost any afterwards. Under Angelo, whom he always worshipped, and who made or marred him, he worked with a will. When Michel went to Rome he placed his young pupil in the hands of that softer,

more graceful master, Andrea del Sarto, painter of the lovely "Madonna del Sacco," of the hardly less charming "Madonna of the Harpies," and of that head of Christ in the "Annunziata" at Florence, of which Vasari himself says: "This is so beautiful that for my part I do not know whether the human imagination could possibly conceive any more admirable representation of the head of the Redeemer."

With such masters and such friends, the world looked bright to Giorgio; but clouds came, and they were black clouds. The terrible plague laid its hand on Arezzo, and seized his loving father, Antonio. About the same time the good people, and the less bad, in Florence, rose up against the Medici, and, casting them out of the city, chose Christ to be their perpetual king. It is to be regretted that the political aspirations of a free people should have since moved them to depose so glorious a ruler.

However, the Medici went into exile, and Cardinal Passerini with them; and Vasari, now friendless, returned to his fatherless home. In the country about Arezzo he ventured to make his first efforts in color, painting devotional pictures for the peasants. When the plague had left the city he went there to live with an uncle, Don Antonio, and while with him painted his first picture in oil, three half-lengths of SS. Agatha, Rocco, and Sebastiano. Giorgio was now sixteen years old; and what metal there was in the youth we gather from his own telling: "And now, had my power equalled my desire, I should have become a tolerably good painter, so earnestly did I labor, and so anxiously did I study my art." Earnest labor, anxious study—these are the key to and the story of his life.

But the problems of art were not the only ones that Giorgio had to deal with. There were two younger brothers and three sisters, all dependent on his labor. Once more he sought the great city, Florence. There he had one dear friend, neither prince nor son of prince, but son of a weaver, Francesco de Rossi, known in art as Francesco Salviati. These two had formed a boys' acquaintance when Vasari first came to Florence with the Cardinal. The plague had separated them, at bitter cost to each, for they had grown to love each other like brothers. Now that both were poor, the bond was all the stronger. For two years they studied, and worked hard and zealously to gain bread and knowledge. Messer Niccolo Vespucci no longer harbored Giorgio: he took refuge in the workshop of a painter, Raffaello del Brescia. Work hard as he might at painting, Giorgio could not thereby support his brothers and sisters; so he set himself to learn the art of the goldsmith. When, in 1529, the army of Charles V. besieged Florence, Vasari went to Pisa, intending there to improve his condition by the practice of his

newly-acquired art; but in Pisa he received some commissions for works in fresco and oil, and was only too glad to put aside goldsmithing for his much beloved painting. Having filled these commissions, he went over the mountains to Bologna, and thence to Arezzo, being compelled to take this roundabout way by reason of the war. At his old home he found that family affairs had improved in his absence, thanks to his uncle's good management. Work came to his hands, and so well did he satisfy his patrons that he was selected to paint in fresco the portico and the ceiling of the Church of San Bernardo, which he did in a way not discreditable to a youth of eighteen. Fortune had once more smiled on him, and, indeed, from this time on to the day of his death, she favored him as constantly as fortune may favor.

He had just finished his paintings in San Bernardo when there came to Arezzo Ippolito de' Medici, his fellow-pupil of seven years before. Alessandro, his other class-mate, was now ruler of Florence, Ippolito himself a Cardinal; while in the Papal chair sat another Medici, Clement VII. Ippolito and Vasari were of about the same age. Since last they met, each had tasted the bitterness of misfortune: now, that Ippolito could help his friend, he was quick to do it. He took Giorgio into his service, and brought him to Rome. There he joyfully met once more Francesco de Rossi, whose talent had attracted the notice of Cardinal Salviati. Francesco having every encouragement and all leisure to continue his studies, Giorgio and he went to work with the old-time vigor. "My perpetual care," says Vasari, "was to draw with unwearying diligence night and day." He saw great men everywhere about him; why should not he attain to the same eminence? They were but of flesh and bones like himself. He would labor and study. There was no work of Raphael's that he and Francesco did not copy; there was, indeed, no work in the Vatican that they did not "fully copy or partially design." During a whole winter they remained in the chill rooms from morning till night. They had no time for anything but drawing. They ate a frugal breakfast, standing; they dined at their work on a piece of bread. To economize time, sometimes the one copied one subject, the other another; at night each copied the other's design.

Not content with this laborious training, Vasari made drawings after Michel-Angelo's grand Sistine ceiling, and copied every good work, ancient and modern, whether of sculpture, architecture, or painting. During his youth he was constant in this thorough system of study, and from each new city that he entered, he carried away designs of all its good things. He had determined to help his family and to become a great artist; and so "he disposed him-

self to endure every extremity of fatigue, and to shrink from no labor, no hardship, no watchfulness, no effort that might contribute to the desired end."

After these severe studies he tried his powers on a large canvas, choosing one of the favorite mythological subjects of the time. In this he succeeded to Ippolito's satisfaction, receiving not only kind words, but substantial pay and new orders. The desire to succeed made him neglect the advice of friends. His overworked body succumbed to the malarious Roman air. To give him a chance of recovery, they transported him in a litter to Arezzo. Only in the December following (1531) was he well enough to go up to Florence. There Duke Alessandro received him most kindly, providing him with a home, a servant, a seat at the ducal table, and means wherewith to live. Vasari set himself now "to learn from every one that knew;" he exercised himself in composition, and studied and copied the mighty works of Michel-Angelo in the new Sacristy of San Lorenzo;—the statues of Giuliano and Lorenzo dei Medici, and the Day and Night, Dawn and Twilight, mysterious as nature's self. Though barely twenty years of age, the Duke chose him to decorate some of the rooms in the Palazzo Medici, and added one honorable commission to another. As Alessandro had a passion for building, Vasari gave all his spare time to the study of architecture, and in this art he made such progress that, when Charles V. visited Florence, Giorgio was prepared to assume the direction of a large part of the decorative constructions set up for the occasion. Gaining knowledge, honor, profit, and skill in his art, he grew meantime in the Duke's favor, and counted on doing great things under his patronage. But, on the 6th of January, 1537, the assassin's dagger made an end of Alessandro. Clement VII. had died in 1534, Cardinal Ippolito in 1535—three great patrons gone within three short years!

Giorgio, so he tells us, now made up his mind to depend no longer on courts; hereafter he would depend on himself and on his work.

To follow his career from 1537 up to 1574, when he died, is to read the record of a busy life. Year by year he grew in reputation. He was sought throughout the length and breadth of Italy. Popes and Cardinals, priors and abbots, princes and merchants were eager to command his services. Could Giorgio have served them all, he would have done so. He was a ready designer and a facile painter, and ever the same constant student. When he went to Rome, in 1538, he gave the best part of his five months' stay to copying "all such antiquities, or other works," as he had not previously designed; "more particularly such things as were in the grottoes beneath

the earth." As to works of sculpture and architecture, not content with drawing these, he measured them all.

The greater part of these last thirty-seven years of his life was spent at Rome and Florence; but there are few important Italian cities in which he did not work. Venice, Verona, Mantua, Parma, Modena, Ravenna, Bologna, Pisa, Rimini, Perugia, Naples—to each of these he was called, and in each his fruitful fancy and rapid brush have left a lasting record of his talent and of the high repute in which it was held. No scheme was too large for Vasari; the larger it was, the more ready was he to undertake it. He wished "to accomplish the difficult and laborious in art;" and that he might be able to do this, he was "constantly seeking new inventions and phantasies."

By 1542 he had made himself easy in the world, married off two of his sisters, settled another in a convent, and built himself a new and commodious house at Arezzo. His early drawing-master, Michel-Angelo, whom Giorgio loved and admired throughout his life, had always been a friend to him; and when he was at Rome, in 1543, Michel, besides showing him much affection and giving him much good advice, made him known to the splendid Cardinal Farnese. Nor were these the only services that Angelo rendered him. After Duke Alessandro's death, whether from a doubt about his own powers or from lack of occasion, Vasari practiced architecture but little, though he did not give up the study of that art. Looking over the many designs he had made, Michel not only commended his ability, but encouraged him to take up architecture anew and in a better manner; this he did with such earnestness and such success that from this time onward it would not be easy to say whether Vasari was more architect or painter.

As year by year we run over the record of his works, we are astonished at their ever-growing number. Putting aside detail, he more than once tells his story in this fashion: This, and this, and this, I painted, "with many other pictures"; or, "at the same time I executed numerous designs, small pictures, and other works of minor importance, for many of my friends. These were, indeed, so numerous and so varied that it would be difficult for me to remember even a part of them."

He painted church and chapel walls, cathedral domes, the refectories of monasteries, palace halls and façades, the interiors of loggie, altar-pieces, portraits, subjects religious, historical, mythological, allegorical—all subjects in all places. Proud of his facility in design, and of his rapid execution, he was ever ready to attempt a feat. It was a time of great conceptions. Princes, churchmen, wealthy citizens, vied with one another in extravagant undertak-

ings. Feverishly impatient until their conceptions were realized, they were as lavish of means as they were saving of time. The artist had but two hands; they sought to supply him with a hundred. He was often forced to be a mere designer and overseer; a crowd of assistants, more or less capable, copying his cartoons under his hurried supervision. The artist's labor was immense; but it was hardly possible that it should add to his artistic credit. At the mercy of others, his designs often lost spirit, life, sense, beauty. The patron gained glory at the artist's expense. One of Vasari's experiences was as remarkable as it was unsatisfactory to himself. Cardinal Farnese, wishing to decorate the Hall of the Chancery, in the Palace of San Giorgio, so as to illustrate the life of the reigning pontiff, Paul III., entrusted the work to Vasari. To carry out the Cardinal's scheme, he found it necessary to remodel the hall. He made the architectural drawings, superintended their execution, supplied the cartoons for twenty different frescoes, including portraits of the Pope, of Sadoletto, Pole, Bembo, Contarini, Paolo Giovio, Michel-Angelo, Charles V., and Francis I., designed a goodly number of ornaments and inscriptions, and completed the whole work within one hundred days. "Being then young," says Vasari, sadly, "I thought only of complying with the wishes of the Cardinal; but it would have been better that I had toiled a hundred months, so only that I had done all with my own hand."

In 1550 Giammaria del Monte, who, as legate of Paul III., had opened the Council of Trent, was elected to the Papal chair under the name of Julius III. Vasari and Del Monte were close friends, and no sooner was the new Pope enthroned than he called upon Giorgio to aid him in carrying out his great schemes for adorning Rome. To Vasari he entrusted the design and superintendence of that tomb of the elder Cardinal di Monte, executed by Ammanati, in San Pietro in Montorio; with Vasari and Michel-Angelo he consulted about the continuation of the work on St. Peter's; and it was Vasari who made all the drawings for the fanciful and extravagant Vigna Julia, the Pope himself supplying the inventions.

Making a hurried journey to Florence in this year, Vasari was very kindly received by Duke Cosmo I., the successor of Alessandro. Cosmo, who had long wished to have Vasari about him, now gave him a pressing invitation to make his home in Florence. His many engagements forbade an immediate acceptance; but as soon as he was at liberty, in 1553, he returned to the "City of Flowers," and placed himself at the Duke's service. Active service it was: Cosmo was ever building new things, and rebuilding the old; making mean things rich, and ornate things sumptuous.

Through him Vasari's name has been linked with the great Florentine architects; with Arnolfo, Fra Sisto, Brunelleschi, Cronaca, Michelozzo, Alberti; and with the most admired structures of the beautiful city; with the Palazzo Vecchio, the Uffizi, the Pitti, the Palazzo Medici (now Riccardi), the Biblioteca Laurenziana; with Santa Maria Novella, Santa Croce, and the Duomo. At the same time that Vasari was constructing and reconstructing buildings, he was busy in decorating them. In addition to painting the "Hall of the Elements," he filled twelve rooms in the Palace with stories from the lives of the Medici, and with others showing the actions of illustrious women, Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and Tuscan. The great Hall of the Palazzo Vecchio he adorned with twenty large paintings, in which was told the history of Florence from the beginning up to his own time. When the prince, Don Francesco, was to marry Joanna, the Emperor's daughter, Vasari must supply the decorations, triumphal arches, views of all the piazzas in the larger Tuscan cities, views of fifteen of the principal cities of the empire, with much other ephemeral work.

Vasari it is who built that great corridor which, crossing the Arno, atop of the Ponte Vecchio, connects the Palazzo Vecchio with the Pitti; and he, too, designed the Portico degli Uffizi, under which we of the New World linger to study the faces of Dante, of Giotto, of Lorenzo il Magnifico, and of our godfather, Amerigo Vespucci. Besides adding a choir and chapels to Santa Maria Novella, designing a choir, altar, tabernacle, and fourteen chapels for Santa Croce, he built a palace for the Duke at Capraja, a church at Colle Mingoli, and fountains at Castello.

Between times he had gone to Rome. Pius V. sent for him in 1572 that he might paint the "Victory of Lepanto" and the "Death of Coligny," in the Sala Regia of the Vatican. Then he must work in the Pope's private chapel, and design sixty-eight cartoons for other chapels. Now he is chosen to succeed his drawing-master, Michel-Angelo, in superintending St. Peter's; now he must repair St. John Lateran's; now conduct the waters of the Acqua Vergine from Salma to Rome. Gregory XIII. will not do without him; he must complete the Sala Regia, which, begun by Paul III., had occupied thirteen painters successively for a term of twenty-eight years. Vasari has but one more thing in life to do. Seeking no higher glory, no more wealth, he declines an invitation to the Spanish court from Philip II.; he would round his labored, honored life by painting Brunelleschi's glorious dome, which crowns brave Florence, above the beauteous walls of Santa Maria del Fiore. He had just finished the Prophets in the Lantern, when death stopped his active mind and hand forever.

This is the man who wrote the "Lives of the Painters," in which is told the story of Italian art from Cimabue down to his own day; no mere sketch of painters' lives, but a detailed narration of their work, and not of painters' work only, but of the work of sculptor, architect, goldsmith, glass painter, modeller in clay, caster of bronze, niellist, and engraver. From his boyhood, for his own pleasure and instruction, and because of a certain affection for the memory of artists, Giorgio Vasari had made note of every detail concerning them which came within his way. By the year 1545 he had accumulated much useful material, the benefit of which we might never have so fully enjoyed were it not for a casual conversation. At that time he was painting the Hall of the Chancery for Cardinal Farnese. After his day's work he often went to sup at the Cardinal's, where he was certain to find a gathering of the most distinguished men, and of the brightest minds in Rome. One evening, the conversation turning on things of art, Paolo Giovio, whose museum gave him authority in such matters, bore the burden of the talk. Giovio, discoursing on the men who had made themselves eminent in art from Cimabue down, expressed the desire he himself felt to write a treatise about these great men, and elaborated his scheme at some length. Vasari, observing that Giovio's acquaintance with his subject was general rather than special, and thus vague and uncertain, while commending the idea, ventured to point out some of Giovio's errors and misconceptions. Directly the whole company, including Giovio, fell upon Vasari, insisting that he should undertake the work Giovio had suggested. This he was not anxious to do, on account of his many other engagements, and for the further reason that he doubted his powers as a writer. However, the Cardinal insisting, and Annibale Caro, Tolomei, and Molza, all men of acknowledged literary ability, adding their persuasions, he finally assumed the task.

With the old-time industry he now applied himself to gathering and arranging material for his book. By correspondence he sought information from distant places; he traced and read the manuscript notes of earlier artists; he consulted contemporary masters and students; he visited, described, and critically examined all the works in the cities through which he passed; he formed collections of the drawings of all good artists, and of models of statues and buildings. The ground was new; the difficulties were many and great; still Vasari did wonders. In 1550 he published a first edition, which was favorably received, bringing him much and well-deserved credit. No one saw its imperfections better than he: during the seventeen succeeding years he labored to amend them. Duke Cosmo encouraged and aided him, affording him every

facility for making new researches throughout Italy. Thus he was enabled to correct errors, to acquire more exact information, and to add many new "Lives." In 1568 he issued a second edition, illustrated with engraved portraits, the drawings for which he had procured, not without great "labor, cost, and pains."

The friend of Popes, of princes, of the most illustrious patrons, literati, and artists of his time, Vasari's position certainly afforded him exceptional advantages in his undertaking. Recalling his artist contemporaries, we find ourselves in the company of the most famous Masters of the Renaissance. Angelo, Del Sarto, Sodoma, Pontormo, Di Credi, Bandinelli, Del Piombo, Giulio Romano, Marc Antonio, Titian, Veronese, Sansovino, Palma Vecchio, Cellini, Ghirlandajo—all these he knew and associated with. Bramante, Botticelli, Francia, Perugino, Da Vinci, Raphael, were still living when Vasari was born; Giorgione had died but a year, Filippo Lippi but seven, and Mantegna but six years before Vasari's birth; so that he was within speaking distance of still another circle of illustrious artists, whose names the few we have mentioned will bring to the reader's mind. From Giotto to Vasari was but one hundred and seventy-six years. The immediate descendants of the fathers of Italian art had just gone; the traditions were fresh; the sources of information were plentiful and reliable; how plentiful and how reliable, almost any one of the "Lives," taken at random, will show.

In a simple, unaffected way Vasari puts before us not only the artist, but the man; his virtues, foibles, idiosyncrasies. Just in his judgment of each artist's work and powers, he is not less just in his judgment of personal character. With him justice does not mean severity. He is kindly-spoken; has a good word, praise, for all good things, and nothing ill to say beyond the truth. From individual virtue, or weakness, he is ever prompt to draw a moral; his aim being not merely to tell a story, or to make a catalogue, but to teach his younger fellow-artists, and those who were to come after him, the way to succeed, and the way to avoid failure. How high his purpose was, we may gather from his "Dedication" to Duke Cosmo in the edition of 1550, and from his address "To the Artists in Design" in 1568. To acquire praise as a writer has not been his object, but rather the glory of art and the honor of artists. As an artist he wished "to celebrate the industry and revive the memory of those who, having adorned and given life to the arts, do not merit that their names and works should be forgotten." He hoped "that the example of so many able men might be of advantage to those who study the arts, and no less those who have taste for and pleasure in them; and that his words might serve as a

spur, moving each to continue laboring worthily, and to seek to advance continually from good to better." Surely it is safer to try to learn something about art and artists from one moved by these good aims, than from some mere maker of books.

The fund of sprightly anecdote, by which Vasari illustrates the character of both artist and patron, the lively pictures he presents of the Italian life, and customs, of the time, and his frequent references to important social and political events, let us into the history, and the spirit, of the Italian renaissance. We become familiar with the great men, hear them speak, see them act. When we have finished "*The Lives*," we have learned more of the springs that moved men's minds in those days, than we can learn from any ordinary history of the period. Indeed, it may be safely said that one must have read Vasari, fully to appreciate certain sides of the renaissance.

His simple style wins our favor. From the first page, we feel secure of his truthfulness, and of his honesty of purpose. He is modest, too, and always Christian. He glorifies great men; but much more God, whose work they are. As we read of his relations with Salviati, Angelo, Gherardi, and the Medici, we cannot but be moved by the warmth of his friendship, his kindness of heart, his lively sense of gratitude; but these rare good qualities do not impress us more than does his constant, manly sense of religion. His acts gave proof of the sincerity of his words. When he had become easy in fortune, he built, at his own expense, and endowed a chapel and decanate in the Deanery at Arezzo, painting the chapel with his own hand. Therein he lovingly entombed the bodies of his father, mother, and immediate relatives. This work he did, "as an acknowledgment (although but a small one) of the Divine goodness, and an evidence of his thankfulness for the infinite favors and benefits which God has vouchsafed to confer upon him."

It would be hard to find a man better equipped for his work; would it not? Honest, truthful, conscientious, generous, patient, thorough, having a rare position among artists, rare facilities to pursue a well considered object, and a serious aim,—what was there wanting? Nothing, if his knowledge of the principles and practice of art fitted him to judge the things of art. Now, it is true that, notwithstanding all that Vasari painted, he has not taken rank among the greatest painters. It would be singular if he had. His talent of ready composition, and facility of brush, with his willingness to undertake everything for everybody, made it impossible that he should produce master-works. These are born of calm reflection, or enthusiasm, and of leisurely execution. Still,

Vasari painted more than one creditable picture. To be among the first, where the first were so great, was not easy; it was even less easy for him, whose admiration for the design of Michel-Angelo made him more a follower of that rare genius than an original master. To hold place among the men of second rate is, however, no mean tribute to his talent and ability. This talent, this ability, his severe studies under the most competent masters and by himself, his large acquaintance with ancient masterpieces, and with the best work of his own country, made him rarely fitted to form a judgment on every work of art. Time has not failed to establish this; for, while new researches have, not infrequently, corrected his facts, his judgments are still the judgments of the best. His mind was cultivated, open, appreciative not of any one art alone, nor of any one time, or school, or country, but of everything great and good. Michel-Angelo's design might be the greatest, but Giotto's art was beautiful, and Fra Angelico's showed not the hand of man, but rather that of saint or angel. From such a teacher, and only from such a teacher, can the beginner in art learn how to form that true taste which is based, not on the vain likings of the self-sufficient and uninstructed, but on the experienced judgment of the trained and thoughtful student.

The practical information, so requisite to the understanding of works of art, Vasari also gives us, and, in few and clear words. Half-a-dozen handbooks will not as well instruct us in approved methods in sculpture, technic in the various kinds of painting, processes of engraving, of modelling, or of casting. Rightly to appreciate art, we must know and appreciate the arts; and the arts, not only of one period, or of one country, but of all countries, and all times. No one knew this better than he whose busy life-record we have so hastily run over. As a help to this large view, he was careful to sketch out the history of ancient art. Archæology was in its infancy when Vasari wrote. We cannot expect from him the solid, detailed learning, or the painfully refined criticism, of the German of to-day; still, he gives the beginner all that is needful, and more than he might gain from more labored work. To complete his intelligent plan, Vasari not only reviewed the varying phases of the arts in Italy, but he also traced their growth in Germany and the Netherlands, and marked the mutual influences of the northern and the southern technic and ideals.

Critics who are taken up with questions about certainty of attribution, exactness of dates, and manufacture of impasto, may find satisfaction only in more modern and more soulless writers; but even these cannot advance one page without recurring to Vasari. He is, and will continue to be, the authority on the art of Italy

during its blooming-time. The book-makers of to-day but paraphrase him, more or less diffusely or succinctly.

Doubtless we cannot master art from one book, or from any number of books. The eye must be educated as well as the mind. Good things must be looked upon. But, rightly to see, we must know how to look and what to look for; and to know how to look and what to look for, we must have art in mind and eye. How is the eye to be trained? By looking on master-works. There shall we learn what beauty is.

It is not possible to know anything of art worth knowing, without a thorough acquaintance with the art of the past; nor to estimate the present good, or bad, without knowledge of the best. The inspection of miles of wall-space, hung with works of Millet, Diaz, Knaus, Bouguereau, Watts, and Meyer von Bremen, can never give us more than what they have of knowledge, or inform us of ideals, or expression, beyond their own. The viewing of pictures by popular painters makes neither lovers of art, nor knowers of art. These are made only by patient study of the best of every time and country, and by communion with great artistic souls. This communion Vasari's book affords, and, therefore, it is as fresh and useful to-day as on the day it first was printed.

Michel-Angelo, in his beautiful sonnet to Vasari, rightly estimated its purpose and its permanence:

“If with the chisel and the colors, thou
Hast made Art equal Nature, now thy hand
Hath e'en surpassed her, giving us her beauties
Rendered more beautiful. For with sage thought
Now hast thou set thyself to worthier toils,
And what was wanting still, hast now supplied,
In giving life to others; thus depriving
Her boast of its last claim to rise above thee.
Is there an age whose labors may not hope
To reach the highest point? Yet, by thy word
All gain the limit to their toils prescribed.
The else extinguished memories thus revived
To new and radiant life, by thee, shall now
Endure, with thine own fame, throughout all time.”



PRIMITIVE MAN AND HIS SPEECH.

Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. XVIII. Article "Philology." Part I.
Science of Language in General. By W. D. Whitney.

THE "Encyclopædia Britannica," of which the ninth edition is in process of publication, shows in its later volumes a somewhat closer approach towards that cosmopolitan or international character which, at the present day, is almost a requisite for any work of its kind. To make a cyclopædia the true exponent of contemporaneous learning, none but the leading minds of the age should be engaged for the treatment of at least all the more important subjects; and, surely, no single nation can lay claim to the possession of the foremost scholars in each branch of learning. How far a reasonable regard for unity and doctrinal soundness may be consistent with such a desire for the highest scholarship, is another question; for, as few will doubt, the progress of modern science has neither been very harmonious, nor invariably in a healthy direction. But, however this may be, in conformity with that international plan, the article on "Philology"—in the eighteenth volume of the British "Cyclopædia"—comes from the pen of two scholars of diverse nationality, and neither of them an Englishman;—the first part, on the science of language in general, being written by the veteran Sanscrit professor of Yale College, W. D. Whitney; the second, on the comparative philology of the Aryan languages, by Professor E. Sievers, formerly of Jena, now of Tübingen. It is upon the American contribution, as the more generally interesting, we propose to offer some remarks. Our highly esteemed countryman's treatise—as a matter of course, admirably written—deals largely with a problem that concerns not the philologist only, but also the philosopher, the historian, the theologian,—in fact, any serious inquirer into the nature and destiny of man. Professor Whitney has, heretofore, in several of his well-known publications on linguistic science, set forth the result of his inquiries into the same question more at length, and, perhaps, here and there, with some slight degree of diffidence; in the article to be reviewed he favors us with a shorter, but most unhesitating and categorical answer. Since, then, the solution of the problem, as therein presented, may be looked upon as the last word in the debate by a scholar of undisputed eminence in his branch, it will be well worth our while to consider his views with

all the attention due to so able a writer. The question referred to is this: How did man come into the possession of language?

Professor Whitney places the problem before us in a form that plainly forebodes the solution he arrives at. With him, the study of language is a division of the general science of anthropology, and the problem of anthropology is this: "How natural man has become cultivated man; how a being thus endowed by nature should have begun and carried on the processes of acquisition which have brought him to his present state." Now, language, according to our author, is one of those attainments that distinguish "man the child of nature" from "man the creature of education;" hence, the science of language must solve the question how man, "by implanted powers, directed by natural desires, and under the pressure of circumstances," has made, changed, and enriched his speech, until, from the first spoken sign, the first sound consciously and purposely uttered to signify conception, it has become that wonderfully rich and multiform body of expression which it is at the present day.

So much for the problem. As to the method of investigation, Mr. Whitney likewise draws the lines closely enough to secure a certain result to the exclusion of all others. "It is," he says, "by studying recent observable modes of acquisition, and transferring them, with due allowance for different circumstances, to the more primitive periods, that the question of first acquisition is to be solved, for language as for tools, for arts, for family and social organization, and the rest. For there is," he adds, "just as much and just as little reason for assuming miraculous interference and aid in one of these departments as in another."

After these preliminary remarks, the learned Professor proceeds to set forth the cause of language-making, which he shows to be simply the desire of communication. He then adverts to the analogy of the beginnings of speech with those of writing, the superiority of voice above all other instrumentalities of expression, and the imitative character of the first spoken signs. He further describes the progress of speech, from what he terms the spontaneous or arbitrary stage, to the traditional or conventional, and points out the peculiar character of human language as distinguished from "brute speech." After this he devotes a paragraph to the important statement that language, far from having played the part of a physical cause in the evolution of man's faculties, is but the necessary product of his natural endowment. He then enters upon the question as to the rate of progress made by man in the art of speaking, "after he came into being such as he now is, physically and intellectually." This question the Professor hesitates to answer, even conjecturally; yet he sees good reason to

hold that, as in other departments of culture, so in language, the very first items "were hardest to win, and cost most time, the rate of accumulation (as in the case of capital) increasing with the amount accumulated. Beyond all reasonable question, however," he continues, "there was a positively long period of purely imitative signs, and a longer one of mixed imitative and traditional ones." Having thus secured a speculative basis, the author enters upon the empirical and more strictly philological part of his treatise, and briefly reviews the diverse phases of language growth from the "root stage," and the exclusive use of signs denoting physical acts and qualities, up to the inflective forms represented by the most highly organized families of speech, and the accumulation of an immense stock of expressions for the most varied non-physical conceptions and relations.

All this is highly interesting and replete with evidences of stubborn study and keen observation; but—thus philosophic readers will be inclined to ask—has the distinguished philologist, ere he discusses the origin of man's speech, not a word to say on the origin of man himself? On this point Mr. Whitney peremptorily—though rather incidentally and later on in his treatise—declares that language has nothing to do with the question of the origin of man, "whether or not developed out of lower animal forms, intermediate to the anthropoid apes." And, in strict conformity with this declaration, he nowhere—in his larger treatises any more than in the article under review—directly or indirectly expresses his opinion on that great question. But since it is impossible to form a theory of the origin of language not in conflict with one or the other of the various opinions on the origin of man, our author by no means leaves us in the dark as to what he does not, or, at least cannot consistently, hold with respect to the latter question. His view is plainly, and at first sight, incompatible with at least one still rather widely accepted evolutionist hypothesis; with other scientific or philosophical theories it will, on closer inspection, be found to be equally, or almost equally, inconsistent; nor can it in any manner be reconciled with the doctrine of creation in the ordinary sense of the word. To show this will be the first part of our task; and if, as we fear, the result of our inquiry should be the strange fact that, whatever view we may take of the origin of man, Mr. Whitney's theory of the origin of language cannot logically be based on it; the next step will be to examine whatever evidences, intrinsic or circumstantial, the Professor may have put forth, or left us to infer, for the support of his view.

Man, then, whose first steps in the art of speaking our excellent author describes with considerable minuteness and absolute assurance, has,—so he tells us,—from the very beginning of his existence

as man, been the identical being he is now, that is, physically and mentally endowed as we are, though in a measure less cultivable, such as the offspring of less cultivated races are still found to be. But although possessed of all the innate faculties to which he owes his superiority over the brute creation, he was utterly destitute of any results of their exercise, including, of course, language. The human beings that began the making of language were exactly in the same position, both as to completeness of endowment and want of outward aid for the exercise of their faculties, as children growing up apart from society would be; or, to use the professor's own words, as "any number of human beings who should be cut off (if that were practicable) from all instruction by their fellows." How long that primitive period of muteness lasted, whether through a series of generations, or during a part of our first parents' lifetime only, Mr. Whitney does not explicitly tell us; but he declares, in his usual clear and direct manner, "that there was a time when all existing human beings were as destitute of language as the dog."

This is express enough; but let us see how that strange assumption agrees with the Professor's equally categorical declaration, that the question as to the origin of language has nothing to do with the problem of the origin of man. The singular condition in which he places primitive man is certainly not a fact of history. If it be a thesis to be inferred from other certain facts, or from demonstrable truths of science or philosophy, we look in vain for a direct proof in the treatise under review, or in any of the Professor's larger works. We must, then, be permitted to ask a number of questions, such as the following: How did the highly endowed, but still speechless, human beings of the period in question come into existence? Were they the offspring of others equally endowed, and equally destitute of language? And if so, how did the first in that series of privileged children of nature come into being? Were they created, or evolved? And if created, in the time-honored sense of the word, did they appear on earth with infantine brains, or those of adults? If evolved, was it specifically or individually? If specifically evolved, and consequently born of non-human parents, was it from beings far below them in endowment, or very nearly their equals, both as to innate faculties and favorable conditions for their exercise? If individually evolved, that is, not sprung from any parent organisms, but developed from a mere protoplasmic germ up to the perfect stature of man, physically and intellectually, which was their condition in the stage immediately preceding that of humanity? It will not do to discard these questions as idle or irrelevant. The degree of probability to be conceded to Mr. Whitney's assumption regarding the

condition of primitive man evidently depends on the answer; and since the learned philologist shirks the inquiry, we must, to the best of our ability, survey the solutions given by others to the problem of the method of man's first appearance upon this globe, as far as they may seem to bear on the question before us.

To begin with the least philosophical of theories, the Darwinian or Haeckelian hypothesis of descent, it would be the height of inconsistency for its upholders to assume a period of speechlessness, however short, in the life of fully developed man, such as Mr. Whitney supposes him to have been when he took the first step towards the acquisition of language. For, in the first place, it is impossible, under the exclusively mechanical view of evolution, to deny absolutely that even the "missing link," the simian ancestor of man, may already have made some feeble attempts at expressing such thought as he was capable of, by gesture, by grimace, and even by voice. But, be this as it may, the next link in the chain, man himself,—not Mr. Whitney's highly gifted child of nature, but Darwin's incipient man, slowly ripening towards perfection,—must have spoken through untold ages before he became our author's fully developed man; and, at that period, he must have acquired means for expressing thought by voice immensely superior to the most significant barking of the dog. For, according to the theory in question, the very acquisition of the peculiar physical and mental characteristics to which man owes the prerogative of speech, presupposes the long-continued actual exercise of those very endowments. Just as the differentiation of the nightingale's larynx, and the development of its musical talent, were conditioned by that songster's, or rather its slowly developing ancestors', twittering in the hearing of possibly the last gigantic saurians, so the development of man's intellectual powers, together with that of his vocal organs, implies his actual speaking far back in the primordial period during which he slowly advanced towards the full stature of man. In the struggle for existence, those nightingales propagated the species which not only happened—by slight variation—to be gifted with more developed larynxes and musical instincts, but also actually employed their melodious voices to attract mates; thus, in the incipient human species, those individuals gained the ascendancy, and perpetuated the race, who, chancing to become possessed of more differentiated cerebral lobes and vocal organs, also made the proper use of their corresponding accomplishments of mind and voice, be it to gain power over their fellows or favor with the opposite sex; and what other efficient use could they make of those faculties, save that of speaking, or, for all we know, even that of singing? The being, then, that was to become man, as he is now, must have been some sort of a speaker uncounted centuries

before he reached his full growth; and no mean speaker at that stage of physical and intellectual maturity at which Mr. Whitney finds him at the outset of his career. But this the learned linguist positively denies, for there was a time when even fully developed man was "as destitute of language as the dog." The Darwinian hypothesis, then, is put out of court. Should it be true, then our author's linguistic theory is fatally sapped; for the completeness of man's physical and mental equipment, at the period of the invention of speech, is its very foundation.¹

In fact, Mr. Whitney, notwithstanding his professed indifference, plainly enough, and very much to his credit, rejects the Darwinian hypothesis; for, in the sequel of the very paragraph that begins with the denial of all connection between the two great problems, he also denies "that the making of language had anything whatever to do with making man what he is, as an animal species having a certain physical form and intellectual endowment." And farther on, supporting the assertion with some sort of evidence, he again says of man "that the acquisition of the first stumbling beginnings of a superior means of communication had no more influence to raise him from a simian to a human being than the present high culture and perfected speech of certain races have to lift them up to something more than human, and specifically different from the races of inferior culture." That the latter observation is as creditable to Mr. Whitney's good sense as it is in harmony with all known facts of anthropology or history, we need not remark; but it is difficult to understand how the learned philologist could, with that conviction, fail to discover the intimate connection between at least one theory of the origin of man and the question as to the origin of language. But be this as it may, the fact remains that the Darwinian hypothesis of descent leaves no room for Professor Whitney's fundamental position.

The verdict will be the same if we examine another theory of evolution, apparently in better accord with our author's anthropological views—a theory that may recommend itself to minds less unphilosophical than Darwin's or Haeckel's, though still incapable of firmly grasping metaphysical truths. We refer to the hypothe-

¹ The above—it is hardly necessary to observe—is not intended to convey the idea that, on the Darwinian hypothesis, actual speaking was required as the *efficient* cause of the development of the human brain, larynx, etc. All we wish to assert and all that is required for our purpose is, that the actual use of those organs (by speaking) was necessary for their growth or differentiation *indirectly* or as *causa sine qua non*. There are, however, Darwinians who conceive language to have been a *working cause* in the process of man's intellectual development. Thus, the philologist of the Haeckelian school, Lazar Geiger, makes of language the mother of reason. One of our brute (irrational) ancestors, by a lucky accident, discovered speech; and speech, as a matter of course, made man the rational being he is.

sis which admits final causes in the process of man's "phylogenetic"¹ development, but still denies all specific difference between him and the brute creation. According to this view, "some force conceived after the analogy of a rational impulse towards an end" (thus Mr. Huxley formulates the idea) has started and guided the evolution of the race, imparting to man, by a slow process of transformation, physical and mental characteristics different from those of the lower animals in degree, but not in kind.

The teleological, but still monistic, view—it must be remarked in passing—does not necessarily exclude the action of physical causes, such as casual variation, transmission by descent, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, and the rest. Accordingly, if these factors be considered necessary for the growth of man's faculties, actual speech is as indispensable a condition of his full development under this, as under the exclusively mechanical view of evolution. But, since Mr. Whitney holds that language had nothing at all to do with the development of man's faculties, we may limit our attention to that construction of the hypothesis under consideration which excludes—as far, at least, as the faculty of speech is concerned—Darwin's physical causes, and the question will be this: At which stage of man's physical and intellectual development did the production of language become possible? And if possible before the term of maturity, why should it not have been actualized? Was there any intrinsic necessity for man to reach his final grade of perfection before he could take the first step—"utterance with intent to signify"—towards the acquisition of language?

Presuming, with Mr. Whitney, the sufficiency of mere animal faculties for the production of human speech, it might still be contended that nothing less than the full wealth of endowment, as now possessed by man, was necessary for the successful elaboration of language. And against this, it might be argued that neither the undeveloped state of the infantine mind, nor the striking deficiencies of intellectually stunted individuals or of degraded savage races, are found to impede the acquisition and proper use, nay, even the enrichment, of language; and that, consequently, much less than the average endowment of man may have sufficed for the "first stumbling beginnings" in the art of speaking. But there is no need of arguing out the case on this or any other line. Our author himself relieves us of the burden. He plainly concedes the possibility of speech, similar though not equal to ours, at a grade of development far below that of man. For, to quote his own words, "if there once existed creatures above the ape and below man, who were extirpated by primitive man as his special rivals in the strug-

¹ *Phylogenetic*, relating to the evolution of the species; *ontogenetic*, relating to the evolution of the individual.

gle for existence, or became extinct in any other way, there is no difficulty in supposing them to have possessed forms of speech, more rudimentary and imperfect than ours." The conclusion is evident. If beings intermediate between man and the anthropoid apes may have spoken, man also may have been in the possession of some sort of language long before he attained to maturity. But Mr. Whitney knows with absolute certainty that there was a time when full-grown man was as destitute of language as the dog; and, if we understand him at all, it was impossible for man, at the outset of his career, to have been a speaker. The Professor does not say so in as many words; but as he does not even attempt to prove that the admitted possibility of speech in an earlier stage of development could not have been actualized, we must conclude that he considers our ancestors' speaking before their full development as an impossibility not worth the trouble of demonstration. But if man *cannot* have spoken before he was endowed as we are now, any theory of his origin according to which he *may* have spoken before that term, is inadmissible. Now, under the view of evolution here discussed, man—as Mr. Whitney indirectly admits—may have spoken in an earlier stage; hence, that hypothesis is as irreconcilable with his theory of the origin of language as the strictly mechanical view of evolution.

As far as we can see, there is but one theory of evolution which positively excludes the possibility of distinctly human or rational speech before the termination of man's (supposed) merely animal existence. That theory, it is true, maintains a specific difference between man and the brute creation, and, consequently, Mr. Whitney, who is wedded to the contrary opinion, cannot be presumed to hold it. But since our object is not to discover what the distinguished philologist does hold, but to show what he cannot consistently hold in regard to the problem of the origin of man, even this hypothesis calls for a short examination; and if it be found incompatible with the assumption of a period of absolute speechlessness in the life of primitive man, another possible prop will be removed from under the Professor's linguistic theory.

The hypothesis in question is a compromise between the peripatetic philosophy and modern biological science. According to it, the human organism evolved from a protoplasmic germ, produced by a supreme and all-powerful intelligence for that special purpose, and destined to pass through a series of transformations analogous to those observable in the embryonal or "ontogenetic" process, that is, in the evolution of the human individual. At each critical period of that process, a higher substantial, though transitory, "form," or psyche, took the place of the preceding one, and guided the further organic and psychical development of the nas-

cent species, thus bringing up the organism to higher and higher perfection, until a being was produced that lacked nothing but the rational soul to become human. At that highest and last stage, a psyche, endowed with the rational principle, and no longer transitory, but final, that is, destined to subsist through all future generations, was—at some stage of the embryonic development—imparted to its progeny, and *homo sapiens*, man endowed with reason, appeared on earth.

The question, for our purpose, will now be this: In which condition, as to utterance and communication by means of voice, were the immediate progenitors of man? Being still destitute of reason, they were, of course, incapable of rational speech; but equipped as they were with all, or almost all, that pertains to the organic nature of man, and a considerable part of what constitutes his psychical endowment, would these beings not give expression to their emotions in a manner vastly more human-like than any of the existing animal species are found to do? There is no difficulty in assuming them to have been in the possession of a form of utterance purely instinctive yet, and lacking, of course, every characteristic that presupposes the agency of the rational principle, but in other respects closely akin to human speech in the "root stage," and such as it would be if confined to the expression of sensuous emotions and conceptions. Provided, then, the immediate ancestors of man possessed such a form of utterance, what would have been the condition of their rational offspring in regard to the acquisition of language? If born with the linguistic instinct of their ancestors, they would, at the proper age, have instinctively spoken like them; if devoid of that instinct, they would have learned their parents' irrational language; but since their spiritual nature enabled them to speak in a specifically human manner, that is, with the conscious intent to signify, and to signify not merely sensuous emotions and conceptions, but abstract ideas, theirs would have been true language. And before they reached the adult age, the rational principle would probably have stamped its impress even on the form of their speech. But be this as it may, the only period during which, on this hypothesis, all human beings in existence were as destitute of language as the dog, would have been the early infancy of the first of our race. If this be all that Mr. Whitney understands by a period of speechlessness in the life of primitive man, the hypothesis in question will agree with his assumption, though in a very restricted sense only. For the first human children would have learned to speak exactly like those born at the present day. They would not have had to create language by the difficult and slow process described by him. We may, then, simply say that our

author cannot hold that hypothesis with any more consistency than those previously examined.¹

¹ The hypothesis discussed above is, perhaps, the most creditable effort made by science to account for the appearance of man upon earth. The learned Jesuit, Father Tilman Pesch, considers it as probably admissible from the mere philosophical point of view, or as far as the *questio juris* is concerned, while, on theological grounds chiefly, he rejects it. The following translation of the passage referring to the question will be found interesting. We quote from that Father's magnificent work, "Die Grossen Welträthsel Philosophie der Natur," vol. ii., p. 193.

"Was it impossible for the Creator—instead of forming the human organism immediately out of inorganic matter, as he has done *de facto*—to call into being a rational soul within an animal organism destined to become man? Could not the human organism have shaped itself in accordance with natural laws, by an inward principle of development? This question evidently transcends the assumptions of the mechanical monistic school; and it would probably be difficult to prove by cogent arguments the absolute necessity of immediate divine action for the production of the human organism; it would probably be difficult to demonstrate the absolute impossibility of natural agencies having been destined and empowered by God to develop gradually the human organism up to the degree of perfection requisite for the reception of a spiritual soul. We read in the Mosaic record that the Creator commissioned natural agencies with the production of *animal* and *vegetal* organisms. Why, then, it may be asked, should such agencies not have likewise sufficed to produce, in an analogous manner, the human organism, as far as its material side is concerned? Why should it be absolutely inconceivable that the Lord God called into existence, together with all other organisms, a purely animal organism, destined from the outset to develop, through a series of transformations, into the human organism? If such had been the case, the same thing, essentially, would have occurred in the case of the human organism that, according to the principles of the Aristotelian school, has actually taken place in the development of every existing human individual."

The learned Jesuit does not touch the linguistic problem in its relation to this hypothesis; but we need only assume the animal organism in question to have, in a superior degree and with due modifications, possessed those physical and psychical characteristics which enable the higher animals to instinctively use voice for the purpose of communication, and there will be no difficulty in conceiving a form of purely instinctive and sensuous, or emotional, but already articulate language. The great variety of sounds and tones produced by mammals and birds for the manifestation of the most diversified sensuous emotions, and understood and heeded by their fellows,—partially, also, by other species,—is known to every observer; and so is the close approach of some animal cries to the sounds of the human voice, a fact attested by the onomato-poetical names for certain beasts and birds found in all languages. On the other hand, there are, as every one knows, not even wanting species capable of mirroring articulate speech—to the end, one is almost tempted to say, of demonstrating the need of something besides highly differentiated organs for the production of true language. All this goes far to show how a merely animal organism could (without miraculous intervention, though not without teleological guidance) have been equipped in such a manner as to need but the infusion of the rational principle to become *speaking man*.

Having quoted what Father Pesch says in favor of the hypothesis in question, we cannot, without injustice, omit the learned Jesuit's remarks on the subject of creation, as considered from the philosophical point of view. He continues:

"Against such considerations the following objection may be made: 'Man steps into the visible world as a being pertaining to an essentially higher order. It may be conceived, no doubt, that the human *individual* be evolved from a purely animal immature form (larva), that has no other purpose in the system of nature save that of forming a transitional stage in the development of man. But if we suppose that a similar transformation from an animal organism into the human has taken place *phy-*

A moment's attention must yet be given to a theory devised, it would seem, for the purpose of reconciling, if such a thing be possible, the doctrine of creation with the evolutionistic tendencies of the age. According to it, the bodies of the first human beings were indeed evolved from protoplasm by natural agencies (teleologically guided), not, however, phylogenetically, but ontogenetically only, that is, instead of being the last offspring of a progressive series of ancestors, the first of our race came into being without the mediation of parent organisms, and attained to the stage immediately preceding that of humanity with a certain degree of rapidity and in a manner comparable, however distantly, to the passage of the butterfly through the transitional forms of the egg, the grub, and the chrysalis. Having reached that stage, they were—as in the last-examined hypothesis—endowed with rational souls by immediate divine action; or, rather, their “animal souls” were endowed with the gift of rationality.

But little need be said on the relation of Mr. Whitney's assumption to this theory. For, as far as the solution of the linguistic problem is concerned, it hardly differs from the one just examined, of which it is but a modification. Evidently, this mode of devel-

logenetically, then larvæ must have existed which, besides serving as transitional forms, had also to play the part of distinct species in the household of nature. From this it follows that from the admissibility of an *ontogenetic* animal origin of man, we may not at once infer the admissibility of an analogous *phylogenetic* origin. Attention must also be paid to the fact that man, as well as the animal or the plant, constitutes a unity (of body and soul). Now, as it is not repugnant that the animal, *notwithstanding* its psychical constituent, was produced by created causes, thus man can have been produced by immediate divine action only, *on account* of his psychical (spiritual) constituent. God, who created the soul, must at the same moment have formed the first human body. Nothing else would have suited the nature and dignity of man.' (Conf. S. Thomas, Summa Theol., I., q. 91, a. 2.)

“As for ourselves, we would not reject this view as untenable. Considerations well worthy of attention make it probable that but the immediate formation of the human body by *God* was perfectly congruous to the *nature* of man. For the very reason that man, by his *nature*, is superior to all other organic beings, it was, *in conformity with his nature*, allotted to him to be brought into being, not—like an animal—as a *part* of creation, but—as its *crown*—immediately by *God*.

“Should this conception be deemed less apposite, then it might simply be said that God bestowed upon man such immediate care in view of the *supernatural* destiny for which, as Christianity teaches us, he is created; and that, consequently, the revealed fact of the formation of the human body by God bears the character of an *exception* from the natural order, of something ‘supernatural,’ of a *miracle*. This view, too, might be supported by many considerations based upon the natural order, as well as on revelation.

“But, be that as it may, may it be believed that God, in His omnipotence and wisdom, had at His disposal still other methods of raising the human body to the summit of its perfection; may it even be asserted that, after the analogy of all other natural processes, the human body must needs have been evolved from an animal state, perhaps in the same manner as the human foetus, according to the peripatetic philosophy, actually does. It is a most credibly attested fact that in reality, not man's soul only, but also his body, came immediately from the hand of the Creator.”

opment would merely have been an abridgement of the longer process of phylogenetic evolution, with the identical result—the production, on the last stage of organic evolution, of beings gifted with instinctive language materially akin to human speech, and but needing the action of the spiritual principle to become true language. Thus primitive man would have found himself at once, and still without miraculous interference, in the possession of a mode of communication immensely superior to the barking of the dog. That hypothesis, then, is as incompatible with our author's pivotal assumption as any other view of evolution.¹

There is but one short step from this last construction of the evolutionist hypothesis to the theory, or, rather, the doctrine of creation. And this is, as far as we can see, the only view of the method of man's appearance on earth that still remains to be examined. If not evolved, in some way or other, man must have

¹ To leave no room for objections on the score of completeness, the following *possible* construction of the evolutionist hypothesis may be included in our review of theories: The first of our race might have been the offspring of parents *far below* them in physical and intellectual endowment. What would have been their condition as to language? Born of a speechless, pitecoid mother, they would have been nursed and protected by her, as the founders of Rome by the she-wolf. This protection must have extended far beyond the term of parental care ordinarily bestowed by brutes on their progeny, or those helpless children would have perished. Thus, they would have learned from their mother and other simian companions all their accomplishments, including their apish jabbering, but no language.

Nothing, indeed, would seem to answer so well all the conditions in which Professor Whitney's children of nature found themselves placed at the outset of their career. Would they not have been obliged to invent the very beginnings of speech, including the simplest sounds of human language? Would their progress in the art of speaking not have been extremely slow?

The agreement is on the surface only. If you admit the possibility, in the specific evolution of organic beings, of a *saltus* as great as the one supposed in that wild theory, you are at once debarred from all right to lay down rules derived from *actual observation*, for the process of intellectual, social, or any other sort of development. The power that, for whatever reasons, would have enabled simian organisms of the supposed low grade of perfection to give birth to beings equipped with all the physical characteristics and intellectual endowments of man, must certainly have been able, and undoubtedly may have had reasons, to modify and shorten, in the case of the beings thus produced, the process of intellectual development also, and either provide them with some sort of rudimentary instinctive speech, or accelerate its acquisition, so as to make them accomplish in a few years what otherwise might have required ages. Children, you say, are not *now* born with instinctive speech. Neither are human children *now* born of apes. The primitive Aryan speech, you object, has not become Greek or English in a few years. Neither did the first fan-tails or "trumpeters" spring from the rock-pigeon in one generation; and what is the distance from rock-pigeons to fan-tails and trumpeters compared with the distance from the ape to man, whom you make the immediate offspring of the ape?

It is an all-important principle with Mr. Whitney that nothing has a right to be admitted as a factor in the first acquisition and the growth of language of which the action is not actually observable or demonstrable in recorded language. If he admits the evolutionistic view in question, that principle goes by the board. That theory, then, cannot be held by the Professor without the most glaring inconsistency.

sprung into being, such as he is, instantaneously, or quasi-instantaneously; he must have been created.

Now the creation of man, and the condition in which he came from the hand of the Creator, may be conceived in diverse ways. Let us first consider the mode presented in the text of the Mosaic record, as understood by Catholic interpreters.

Creation, in the strict sense of the word, is the bringing into existence of any substance, whether material or spiritual. In this sense the soul only of Adam was created; his body was formed from preëxisting matter. And so was that of the first woman; though in her case not merely a new combination, but also a miraculous growth of matter, would seem to have taken place. But let this be as it may, the shaping of both protoparents' bodies was not entrusted to natural agencies or second causes; and hence it is customary to apply the term "created" to their whole being, including the bodily organism and the "informing" soul. The first of our race, then, sprang into being in a state of maturity which, in the case of their descendants, is but the outcome of a slow process of development and exercise. They were not merely endowed, physically and intellectually, as we are, but from the first moment of their lives exercised their faculties of body and mind in a degree corresponding to the end of their existence in the state of probation, which was "to know, to love, and to serve God."

What, then, under this view, must have been the condition of primitive man in regard to language? He spoke at once. Even before a helpmate was given to Adam, he exercised the linguistic faculty—mentally, if not orally,—in his familiar converse with God, and certainly by actual utterance in his giving names to the living beings that surrounded him. And he spoke as never man has spoken since. His language, being in harmony with all other gifts showered upon him by his Maker, and befitting his exalted position, was one of unsurpassed fitness for the expression of thought. As his body was that of an adult, who would have passed in a perfect manner through the ordinary stages of development, including the exercise of the organs of sense and locomotion, so his mind was not a *tabula rasa*, but developed like that of an individual that would have been subject from infancy to a faultless training by master minds. For every idea, then, that existed in Adam's soul there was also given the corresponding linguistic expression. In what form of language he may have spoken, the monosyllabic, the agglutinative, the inflective, or some form different from all those now in existence, it would be idle, indeed, to investigate; nor will it ever be known to what extent his speech was affected by his fall. For our purpose it is enough to know

that Adam spoke, both before and after that fatal event. The doctrine of creation, then, as understood by orthodox ecclesiastical teachers, positively excludes a state of speechlessness in the life of primitive man.¹

There is, however, a view of creation that assumes—with what consistency we shall presently see—the absolute rudeness of the first human beings. The crude and hybrid theory we refer to was broached by some of the rationalistic theologians, chiefly Germans, of the last century, and may still be favored by a few, who, though averse to evolutionism in any of its forms, are yet unwilling to accept the biblical narrative as an exact record of the fact and the circumstances of creation. They admit the formation of the first human organisms by immediate divine action, but conceive the minds of the beings thus produced to have been *tabula rasa* in the strictest sense of the word. Endowed with all the innate faculties that belong to the intellectual nature of man, the first pair—or pairs, as some would have it—were still destitute of any of the results of their exercise—the very children of nature of Professor Whitney's anthropology. Let us, then, see how far that view of creation may agree with his fundamental supposition.

We may safely leave aside the possibility of the first men having been created in the shape of new-born infants or young children. The idea appears preposterous even to the school in question. They were, then, full-grown men and women. If so, they entered at once upon the task of forming a language. For "any human beings," our professor assures us, "that should be cut off from all instruction by their fellows, would *at once* proceed to recreate language;" that is, we presume, as soon as they reached the proper

¹ The above view, as to the state of Adam's mind, is set forth with great lucidity by Suarez (De Op. VI. Dierum et An. L. iii., c. 6, 9). "Certum est, Adam, statim ac fuit creatus, habuisse naturalem scientiam a Deo sibi inditam." "Scientia rerum naturalium Adamo indita in sua essentia fuit ejusdem speciei cum illa, quae inventionem et ratiocinio humano potest acquiri, i. e., fuit per accidens infusa, seu quoad modum supranaturalis, non per se et in sua entitate; adeoque Adam in ejus usu habebat, ut nos, dependentiam a phantasia, speculando ejus phantasmata; haec tamen erant in phantasia seu in sensu interno aut cogitatione a Deo infusa, uti et species intelligibiles, quae, licet non essent per sensus acceptae nec a phantasmatibus acquisitis abstractae, erant tamen tales, quales per sensus et phantasmata acquiruntur, i. e., infusae per accidens et in substantia naturales, sicut habitus scientiae Adami, atque ejusdem rationis cum illis, quae a phantasmatibus abstrahi potuissent."

. Applying the same principle to Adam's speech, we would say: Any specimen of that language—supposing one having come down to us—would probably disclose to the practised eye of the philologist the same marks of growth which he discovers in all recorded speech, with none of its irregularities and blemishes, just as a chemical analysis of the wine served at Cana upon the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, would probably have shown all the ingredients and combinations of wine, grown and prepared by the usual slow process, with none of its impurities and defects. There was nothing supernatural in that language, though its mode of acquisition was different from all modes now observable. But more about this on another occasion.

age for the efficient use of those organs and faculties upon which the language-making power depends. Consequently, the parents of our race, being adults, began to speak on the first day of their existence. And imperfect though the first stumbling beginnings in the art of giving utterance to their thoughts may have been, their language, being human, was immensely in advance of all the means of expression in the power of the dog. The only period of speechlessness, then, in the life of primitive man, was the probably very short term between the moment of creation and the utterance of the first sound with conscious intent to signify. Still, even a minute, or a fraction of a minute, is "time;" and hence we are compelled to confess that one theory at least of the origin of man is not incompatible with Mr. Whitney's assumption.

But, however consistent with his views, can a theory so intrinsically inconsistent be considered admissible by a scholar of Mr. Whitney's penetration? We would do him an injustice were we to entertain the thought for a moment. If the Creator could call into being human bodies in an advanced state of development, it was certainly in His power to impart to them souls equally developed. And if there were reasons for Infinite Wisdom to dispense, in the case of the first men, with the natural laws of bodily growth, the same, if not stronger, reasons existed for an analogous dispensation in regard to their psychical development. The placing of infantine brains into the skulls of adults would presuppose a sort of retrograde course in the plan of creation, as uncalled for as would be a machinist's putting James Watt's tea kettle as a boiler into a three hundred horse-power engine. An adult human being, absolutely destitute of mental training and experience, would be a monster; and the ushering into the world of such a being, not an act of divine wisdom, but a folly, a miracle as aimless and unreasonable as the creation of an animal devoid of every instinct necessary for the preservation of its existence. And the life of man in that state would have been short indeed, especially in the case of the coexistence of any rivals in the struggle for life. A miraculous providence, of course, could have saved those miserable beings; but if the miraculous be at all admitted into our conception of the first beginnings of the human species, it is perfect folly to circumscribe the extent of that agency—to assign arbitrary limits to the Creative power, or to legislate for infinite wisdom.¹ The only consis-

¹ An almost ludicrous instance of the inconsistency into which the school in question is particularly liable to be betrayed, occurs in Jacob Grimm's (very interesting) essay on the origin of language (in *Abhandlungen der Koeniglichen Academie der Wissenschaften*, 1851). That eminent scholar counts among the reasons why more than one pair should have been created, the following: "The first mother might possibly have given birth to sons only, or to daughters only, thus rendering the propagation of the race impossible." The good old man graciously concedes to the

tent course is, either to reject the whole doctrine of creation, or to accept it as part and parcel of a supernatural revelation, with all its details; and, we may as well add, to understand those details as understood and proposed to our belief by the only authority in the world that claims assistance from above for the infallible interpretation of matters supernaturally revealed. Now, whatever be the final definition, by that authority (if ever to be issued), of the dogmatic truth as to the formation of the first human bodies, the Catholic doctrine concerning the protoparents' intellectual condition is definite; they never were in a state of absolute rudeness.

There is no room, then, in the doctrine of creation for the fully developed man destitute of language as the dog. There is, as we have seen, no solid foothold for that anomalous being in any of the divers constructions of the evolutionistic hypothesis. Unsustained by supernatural revelation, unsupported by science and philosophy, fully developed and still speechless man hovers before our sight, an airy phantom, a baseless vision, a puzzle infinitely more difficult of solution than the problem itself for whose disentanglement that condition of primitive man has been assumed by our author.

But perhaps our horizon is still too confined. Science has not yet said the last word on the question of our origin. The near future may solve the problem in a manner more consistent with Professor Whitney's conception of our primitive condition. In any event, in the present state of uncertainty as to the beginnings of our race, that problem must not be allowed to interfere with conclusions independently arrived at by means of sound philosophical considerations and linguistic facts properly interpreted. Are there such considerations and such facts amply sufficient to prove the invention and slow elaboration of language by fully developed man? Professor Whitney appears to think so. If we understand him rightly, the nature of language itself, all the observable modes of its acquisition and growth, and the very form of human speech in its earliest known stages, fully warrant the truth of his assumption. Our task, then, is not completed. A separate paper, however, will be required for the discussion of this and other questions connected with the inquiry into the origin of language.

Creator the power to call into being adults, and the wisdom to make them men and women, but (implicitly) denies his ability to determine the sex of their offspring.

The same scholar, to whom linguistic science owes so much, who was a child when he went "beyond his last," considers the "chimera" of an implanted language sufficiently refuted by the observation that it would have been contrary to divine justice to let the God-given speech of the first parents decline from its acme for the use of their less favored descendants. And almost in the same breath he acknowledges that whatever losses language may have suffered, they were in most cases, and almost at once, compensated by gains in other directions.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA UNDER THE FRENCH RÉGIME.

IT may seem unexpected that the subject of Establishments should have any special connection with a consideration of the Church in Canada. Such, however, will be found to be the fact,—indeed, to a thorough understanding of our subject, reference must be had to what was in reality a State Establishment in England, as well as to what was believed to be a State or National Church of France. At the risk of being tedious, it may, perhaps, be desirable to examine briefly how far the term “establishment” is applicable and appropriate to churches generally. A misconception in regard to this and some cognate matters has not only engendered a considerable amount of bad feeling in this country, but has given rise to prejudices and opinions which are positively unjust and unfounded, so far as Catholics are concerned. Mere individual opinion might go, as it has largely gone, for nothing. But it is otherwise with judicial determination. The judges of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in England, having before them every day questions bearing on their own State Church, may very naturally import corresponding impressions into the consideration of a case wherein the Catholic Church may be represented to be a State Church. They have assumed, for example, that during the French rule in Canada the Catholic Church was established by law; and that since 1763, when that country passed into the hands of the English, though it may not have been an establishment “in the full sense of the term, it nevertheless continued to be a Church recognized by the State.” It was one, therefore, over which the State could exercise some control. An establishment for non-Catholics generally is an institution over which the State presides, over which there might be a minister of public worship; and it presupposes a condition of things wherein the law could put an end to the establishment or to the parliamentary religion, just as the law created it. “The Anglican theologians,” says De Mais-tre, “often call their Church the Establishment, without perceiving that this single word annuls their religion.” The word in its usual acceptation is not used by Catholic writers regarding the Catholic Church.

The popular view of a State establishment becomes the more important to correct, inasmuch as one hears a good deal of a French National Church,—the “liberties” of the Gallican Church,—the

right to appeal from an ecclesiastical to a lay tribunal, commonly called the *appel comme d'abus*, and other matters now of some antiquity. Several industrious local writers, setting out with conclusions and adducing only such evidence as went in support of them, have discovered a National Catholic Church in Canada—an Established Church—a Church with the Gallican liberties (so they are called) of the Church of France, a royal as opposed to a Papal supremacy; and with much bewailing these writers have adverted to the Ultramontane Church of the Vatican Council, under which for the first time Canada was brought under Rome, and the beloved national element put an end to. It is not likely that these gentlemen will change their opinions, even when these misconceptions are corrected; but it is due to those desiring to know the real state of affairs to have the truth put before them. The Catholic Church is not, and was not, and cannot be a national church in Canada or elsewhere; it cannot be “established” as is the church familiar to their lordships of the Privy Council; the supremacy of the Church is and has always been that of the Pope of Rome; and, finally, the Canadian Church was as ultramontane in the time of Louis XIV., and of the Popes who opposed him, as it was after the Vatican Council. It must needs be repeated very often in certain quarters that every Catholic is, so to speak, an ultramontane Catholic, and that whoever is not ultramontane is no Catholic.

The teaching of the Catholic Church on what lies at the foundation of this question of establishments may be found set out with great clearness in the famous Encyclical Letter, *Immortale Dei*, of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., on “The Christian Constitution of States,” dated the 1st November, 1885. After referring to the office of the Church in “watching and legislating for all that concerns religion, of teaching all nations, of extending as far as may be the borders of Christianity, and, in a word, of administering its affairs without let or hindrance, according to its own judgment,” the Holy Father proceeds to show that the Church always claimed this authority from the time the Apostles maintained that God rather than man was to be obeyed. The Catholic belief on the relations of the Church and the State is thus expressed: “God, then, has divided the charge of the human race between two powers, viz., the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine and the other over human things. Each is the greatest in its own kind; each has certain limits within which it is restricted, and there is, we may say, a world marked off as a field for the proper action of each. . . . So, then, there must needs be a certain orderly connection between these two powers, which may not unfairly be compared to the union with which soul and body are

united in man. What the nature of that union is, and what its extent, cannot otherwise be determined than, as we have said, by having regard to the nature of each power, and by taking account of the relative excellence and nobility of their ends; for one of them has for its proximate and chief aim the care of the goods of this world, the other the attainment of the goods of heaven that are eternal. Whatsoever, therefore, in human affairs is in a manner sacred; whatsoever pertains to the salvation of souls, or the worship of God, whether it be so in its own nature, or, on the other hand, is held to be so for the sake of the end to which it is referred, all this is in the power, and subject to the free disposition, of the Church; but all other things which are embraced in the civil and political order are rightly subject to the civil authority, since Jesus Christ has commanded that what is Cæsar's is to be paid to Cæsar, and what is God's to God."

If this ecclesiastical power is entrusted to the Catholic Church, and if she has charge of divine things as fully as the civil power has charge of human things, it follows that the Church has as good a claim—indeed the same claim—to the possession of her power as the State can show for its own. Whatever the extent of that power may be, it cannot, on the one hand, be lawfully abridged by a hostile civil power, or, on the other hand, be confirmed or more fully "established" by the action of a friendly civil power. The Church is entitled to this power, not by virtue of a mere human law, but independently of any human law, and if needs be, in spite of it. The Catholic Church, therefore, in a higher sense than that in which the word is generally used, is "established," but not established by any civil or human authority.

The Catholic Church never was and never can be "established by law," in the accepted meaning of the phrase, because a Church so established comes to mean one that depends on the laws of some particular State or country for its existence and support. It, therefore, at the best, can be no more than a State or National Church. It cannot be catholic,—it cannot be universal. As it may be established in a dozen different countries, it will necessarily be required to conform to the civil or municipal law of the land in each of these; and, therefore, it is in vain to expect that there should be unity, because there never was, and never will be, two countries in the world governed by the same local laws. If the civil or temporal affairs of the whole world were entrusted to some new Cæsar Augustus, and if the subjects of his authority undertook, in union with him, to "establish" the Catholic Church by means of an imperial edict, or act of parliament, that would mean, and mean only, the recognition of the Church to have charge

over spiritual affairs in its own legitimate sphere. This would still fall short of an establishment as popularly understood.

"The theory of established churches," says Cardinal Manning, "demands an ecclesiastical supremacy in the civil power. The two come and go together; and when the ecclesiastical supremacy is declining, the days of establishments are numbered. . . . A church that consents to be established at the cost of violating its divine constitution and its own conscience, is not a church, but an apostasy. No establishment by State laws and State support has ever been or can ever be accepted by the Catholic Church at the cost of its own divine constitution. The Catholic Church can stand, and has stood, for centuries in relations of amity with the civil powers of the world; but in the sense of establishments here understood, the Catholic Church has never been established in any kingdom upon earth."

Since the breaking up of Christendom in the sixteenth century, it is manifest that the phrase, "established by law," as applied to churches, must be restricted to national churches, or to such as are fostered or controlled by the will of any one sovereign people. But there is no longer a Christendom. When there was such, the Roman Pontiff was its head and the Catholic Church was its recognized Church. The temporal authority in each country naturally wanted, and sometimes imperatively required, particular regulations; and in this regard the Chief of Christendom, for the sake of peace or for other good and sufficient reasons, made special arrangements with that country—made concordats. In the Encyclical on Civil Government already referred to, it is said that "sometimes, however, circumstances arise when another method of concord is available for peace and liberty; we mean when princes and the Roman Pontiff come to an understanding concerning any particular matter. In such circumstances the Church gives singular proof of her maternal good-will, and is accustomed to exhibit the highest possible degree of generosity and indulgence."

Protestant writers, to whom the idea of a universal authority in spirituals, or a Catholic Church, is objectionable as affording a twofold argument against themselves and in favor of Catholicity (so to call the Church), have readily taken up the idea of national churches, either as the mere creation of the State, as Hobbes in his "*Leviathan*" has it, or as an organization for spiritual affairs coexistent with the civil government of the people, as is the more recent and less humiliating view. This theory, however, puts a church on a very temporal and precarious foothold and entirely at the mercy of the populace, who, as once before, might cry out for Barabbas, because the people, the king and Parliament in England, for example, could repeal the Act of Supremacy, could

declare the religion of the State to be anything or nothing, and wipe out the Church it had established; and do all that in a regular and constitutional way. Indeed, the days of the Church of England as a legal establishment are likely to be numbered, and may from constitutional, revolutionary, or external causes be completely annihilated. From a regular and compact Christendom we find there have been experiments with national churches; and now there is but one remaining step, from a few straggling and debilitated establishments to no church at all.

In the sixteenth century the English people achieved a separation from Christendom and established a national church. It was the ingenious theory of some of her historians that this national church is the original and genuine *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the Church whose rights were maintained inviolate in Magna Charta, and concerning which the repeated statutes of the Plantagenets form no inconsiderable portion of the legislation of the kingdom.¹ But it is undisputed that the Roman Pontiff had great control over the Church, that up to the time of Henry VIII. an appeal lay to him; that he had the right of nominations to vacant sees and to the heads of monastic institutions; that he confirmed all appointments of archbishops and bishops; and that a rupture between him and the king was the cause of the establishment of a national church of England and a separation from the Universal Church of Rome.

What took place in England is not pertinent to our subject, except in so far as reference is made to English church establishments. The abolition of appeals which Henry VIII. wanted, and the separation which finally resulted from his quarrel with the Pope, turned out to be two very different and, perhaps, unexpected things. But it is quite certain that other monarchs in Europe before and after his time were equally desirous, if not to nationalize the Church, at least to control it as much as possible. The history of Western Europe at the period we refer to is largely taken up

¹ This theory sits uneasily on the "Declaration of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry," put forth by authority of Queen Elizabeth in 1562, and approved of by the 35th Article of the Church of England. This describes the Church as fallen into the "pit of damnable idolatry, in which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age by the space of above eight hundred years, unspoken against in a manner." That was declared to be the case, "not only with the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise; not the people only, but the bishops; not the sheep, but also the shepherds," etc. Rowland, a grave constitutional writer, says: "Our ancestors were certainly Roman Catholics," and then he goes on to resist the imputation that they were "Papists." If they were not "Papists," it is difficult to understand the statute respecting appeals to Rome, or Henry VIII.'s quarrel with the Pope.

In an article in the *British Quarterly Review* for January last, a writer on this subject says: "Whatever else the Reformation did, it gave to the sovereign that supremacy over the Church which was formerly held by the Bishop of Rome. . . . The bare fact from which we must start is, that the Bishop of Rome before the Reformation was supreme head of the Church in England."

with kingly encroachments on the power, spiritual and temporal, of the Papacy. Germany, Spain, France, might be considered as well as England. In the case of France, for example, we find concordats and pragmatic sanctions between the Roman Pontiffs and the kings, in order to come to an understanding on the particular matters of their nation. To say that because of these arrangements France or Spain had set up a national church, as happened in England, and had become independent of the Holy See, is what cannot be justified. Yet that lies at the foundation of an error within the consideration of so modern a subject as the status of the Church in Canada. The learned reader will withhold his decision as to the relevancy of some things here set out, which are well known, in order that the subject may be fully grasped. We hear of the Gallican Church, the liberties of the Gallican Church, and sometimes of the Gallican school of theology, until it is paralleled with the Anglican Church; and, finally, a grave bench of judges think that there is something in it, and what is more important, a grave question came near being decided in reference to all this. Writers in Canada have espoused this national church, and have given day and document for the transition from the Gallican Church of the past to the Ultramontane Church of our own day.

It is difficult to conceive nowadays the position the Catholic Church occupied in England in very early times, or even in times immediately prior to Henry VIII. The bishop's see at first was commensurate with a kingdom, the parish with a township. The bishop had then his own courts, and everything relating to the care of souls was to be adjudged therein. The law of these courts was the canon and episcopal law; and when the bishop excommunicated, the royal authority gave its full support towards carrying out the sentence.¹ The ecclesiastical courts decided all questions of wills, of legitimacy, and of marriage, and came very near absorbing all the litigation concerning contracts. Any man who could read might claim to have his case handed over to the ordinary,—the Bishop,—and so claim his "benefit of clergy." The wonder was that the king's court had anything to do. The king's council, or ultimate court, had no jurisdiction by a final appeal over these ecclesiastical courts; but an appeal, however, lay to Rome. Not only were the clergy possessed of their separate judicatures, in which they administered their own law, but they formed a separate order in the State. The Lords Spiritual were

¹ As long as the Convocation of the Established Church in the time of Henry VIII. had any power, things were not done so decently. The bishops could imprison on the mere charge of heresy, and when the cause came to trial the proceedings were in accordance with neither law nor justice.

selected from the ecclesiastical chiefs; they had their convocations in York and Canterbury, sitting regularly at the same time as the Commons, and being summoned with them. They, it is said, disputed the supreme legislative authority with the civil power in the State. They were in a majority among the peers, they had immense wealth, they were exempt from taxation. So far, then, from being a church "established by law," the Catholic Church in England was a separate, independent power in the State; and this position was accorded it by the oaths of kings and by repeated acts of Parliament. In upwards of twenty statutes during the Norman and English periods the "liberties" of the Church always appear. It claimed the sole right to define doctrines of faith and morals and to fix the limits of its own jurisdiction in that sphere. It taught that the civil power was to be obeyed in its own sphere; it was in union with, and subject to, the Popes of Rome. This was the Church of England in Catholic times, is the Church of the Vatican Council, and is the teaching of the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on the relation of the State to the Church at this very hour. This is ultramontaniam, and it is, and has been always, opposed to national churches or mere State establishments. "The Church in England, in Catholic times, was not established," says Cardinal Manning, "and when an establishment appeared it ceased being Catholic."

But Henry VIII. and his successors changed all this. The ecclesiastical courts are no more; their particular law is good only so far as it is not repugnant to the law of the land. Wills and matters testamentary are now looked after in the Probate Division of the High Court of Justice. Convocation is only a meeting for an adjournment. Some spiritual peers there are, but they sit as barons, the lowest of the five orders of nobility in the United Kingdom. The national church is not relatively to the State what the Church was in former times. Questions for the care of souls are now disposed of by lay, and not by ecclesiastical tribunals. The Church of itself has no authority.

The judicial committee of the Privy Council now decides what is, or what is not, heresy as opposed to the Thirty-nine Articles; and they are the judges of the legal tests of doctrine in the Church of England. These articles are rendered law and good religion by the statute 13 Elizabeth. And so the same judicial committee has decided on the canonicity of the books of the Old and the New Testament, the "real, active, objective presence" in the communion, as also the state of depravity sufficient to disentitle a communicant from receiving the communion. The manner of baptism has been defined by law, as well as all that is legal and salutary to believe so far as regards the same sacrament. The

communion table, the altar, the crosses, the candlesticks, the lighted candles, the vestments, the bread for the service, and many other kindred matters, are judicially laid down in English law as minutely as is the law of landlord and tenant. The legal posture of the clergyman has been carefully regulated. For instance, it has been held illegal for him in the celebration of the communion to elevate the elements above his head, or to mix water with the wine, or to use incense, or to kneel or prostrate himself before the elements. To bow one knee has been held a breach of the discipline of the Church; as also a practice of the minister to stand with his back to the people.¹ Decisions of this kind are not confined to the ones so well known as the *Maconochie* case, but numbers like it can be turned up in the law reports. This will give a fair idea of what is meant by a Protestant church as established by law in England.

How does all this compare with the Church of France—the Gallican Church? Louis XIV., it is true, had his differences with the Popes, but there was no such fatal quarrel with Rome as appears in English history. Relations, such as they were, often unsatisfactory to both parties, were maintained between the head of the Church and the head of the nation; but at no time did the parliaments or other civil tribunals profess to decide on the doctrine, the liturgy, or the discipline of the Church. The Catholic Church was no more an established church in France in the time of Louis XIV. than was the Catholic Church in England in the time of Edward III. Let us see how far it can be called a national church. From the time that Valentinian commanded the Gallican Church to submit to the Pope, down to the famous Articles of 1682, there is, on the face of French history, abundant evidence of the ultramontane or Papal, as opposed to the national or Gallican, character of the French Church. After she received the pallium from Rome, we have repeated pragmatic sanctions and concordats between the French kings and the Popes; for instance, the pragmatic sanction (now by many regarded as spurious) of Saint Louis in 1268, that agreed on at Bourges in 1438 with Charles VII., the concordat of 1515 between Francis I. and Leo X., abolishing this objectionable treaty with Charles VII.

The Gallican Church was, therefore, controlled to some extent by a power outside the French nation, and so was not national; it was ultramontane. These negotiations between France and the Holy See necessarily presume two things: 1st,—to use language not quite exact, but popular enough to be understood,—the dependency of the French Church on the Roman; 2d, privileges or

¹ See Moore's *Privy Council Cases*, New Series, vol. vii., page 167; vol. ii., page 375; vol. xv., page 1; *Weekly Reporter*, vol. xx., page 804; and *Jurist*, page 443.

concessions, liberties or slaveries, of the French Church, either towards the Roman Pontiff or towards the king. For the king, especially Louis XIV., used the influence of the Pope against the clergy, and availed himself of the clergy to make terms with the Pope. The French clergy were, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in a peculiar position as regards the king and the royal treasury. They were possessed of considerable means, and aided the king very materially in liquidating the burthens of his kingdom. They were in a position to ask favors, and the king, having conceded some, was similarly in a position to command their subjection. "It has always been a maxim of the French court," says Ranke, "that the papal power is to be restricted by means of the French clergy, and that the clergy, on the other hand, are to be kept in due limits by means of the papal power. But never did a prince hold his clergy in more absolute command than did Louis XIV. A spirit of submission without parallel is evinced in the addresses presented to him by that body on solemn occasions. . . . And certainly the clergy of France did support their king without scruple against the Pope. The declarations they published were from year to year increasingly decisive in favor of the royal authority. At length there assembled the Convocation of 1682. 'It was summoned and dissolved,' remarks the Venetian ambassador, 'at the convenience of the king's ministers, and was guided by their suggestions.' The four articles drawn up by this assembly have from that time been regarded as the manifesto of the Gallican immunities. It was the opinion of contemporaries that, although France might remain within the pale of the Catholic Church, it yet stood on the threshold, in readiness for stepping beyond it. The king exalted the propositions above named into a kind of 'Articles of Faith,' a symbolical book. All schools were to be regulated in conformity with these precepts; and no man could attain to a degree, either in the juridical or theological faculties, who did not swear to maintain them.

"But the Pope also was still possessed of a weapon. The authors of this declaration—the members of this assembly—were promoted and preferred by the king before all other candidates for episcopal offices; but Innocent refused to grant them spiritual institution.

"They might enjoy the revenues of those sees, but ordination they did not receive; nor could they venture to exercise one spiritual act of the episcopate."

The measures which Louis XIV. employed to coerce the Pope are matters of general history, and are detailed by Ranke, Gerin, Rohrbacher, and other historians. The king found it impolitic to have the Pope as his enemy, and place the Church to which he

himself and the French people were attached on the eve of what threatened to be a schism. Pope Innocent XI. remained firm, and so the king made a virtue out of his necessities, and went to the other extreme by his hostility towards the Huguenots. He withdrew from the position he had taken towards the Pope.

Ranke, after describing the change in the king, and the political complications of Western Europe that seemed to have driven him to it, proceeds thus :

“It is true that when this result ensued, Innocent XI. was no longer in existence ; but the first French ambassador who appeared in Rome after his death, 10th of August, 1689, renounced the right of asylum ; the deportment of the king was altered ; he restored Avignon, and entered into negotiations.

“And that was all the more needful, since the new Pope, Alexander VIII., however widely he may have departed from the austere example of his predecessor in other respects, adhered firmly to his principles as regarded the spiritual claims of the Church. Alexander proclaimed anew that the decrees of 1682 were vain and invalid, null and void, having no power to bind even when enforced by an oath. ‘Day and night’ he declares that he thought of them ‘with bitterness of heart, lifting his eyes to Heaven with tears and sighs.’

“After the early death of Alexander VIII., the French made all possible efforts to secure the choice of a Pontiff disposed to measures of peace and conciliation ; a purpose that was indeed effected on the elevation of Antonio Pignatelli, who assumed the tiara with the name of Innocent XII., on the 12th of July, 1691.

“But the Pope was not by any means more inclined to compromise the dignity of the Papal See than his predecessors had been, neither did there exist any pressing motive for his so doing, since Louis XIV. was supplied with the most serious and perilous occupation by the arms of the allies.

“The negotiations continued for two years. Innocent more than once rejected the formulas proposed to him by the clergy of France, and they were, in fact, compelled at length to declare that all measures discussed and resolved on, in the assembly of 1682, should be considered as not having been discussed or resolved on : ‘Casting ourselves at the feet of your Holiness, we profess our unspeakable grief for what has been done.’ It was not until they had made this unreserved recantation that Innocent accorded them canonical institution.

“Under these conditions only was peace restored. Louis XIV. wrote to the Pope that he retracted his edict relating to the four articles. Thus we perceive that the Roman See once more main-

tained her prerogatives, even though opposed by the most powerful of monarchs."

Ranke does not in any way question the authenticity or effect of the retraction. He then proceeds:

"The words of the king, in his letter to Innocent XII., dated Versailles, September 14th, 1693, are as follows:

" 'I have given the orders needful to the effect that those things should not have force which were contained in my edict of the 22d of March, 1682, relating to the declaration of the clergy of France, and to which I was compelled by past events, but that it should cease to be observed.' In a letter of the 7th of July, 1713, that we find in Artaud's "*Histoire du Pape Pie VII.*," 1836, tom. ii., p. 16, are the following words: 'It was falsely pretended to him [Clement XI.] that I have dissented from the engagement taken by the letter which I wrote to his predecessor; for I have not compelled any man to maintain the propositions of the clergy of France against his wish; but I could not justly prevent any of my subjects from uttering and maintaining their opinions on a subject regarding which they are at liberty to adopt either one side or the other.'"

This was the condition of Gallicanism in France when Canada was a French colony. The reader need not be detained with any account of the "liberties" (or "slaveries," as Catholic writers call them) of the French Church. They seem, at this distance of time, to resolve themselves chiefly into an annihilation of the Papal authority and an exaltation of the claims of the national clergy. The articles of 1682, some think, were the mildest expression of these liberties;¹ others consider them as the extreme limit of the kingly encroachments. The first, second, and fourth relate to the Pope and the Councils, and do not concern the subject here in hand. The third article assumes that the Papacy is inferior to the Episcopacy, and in France is subject to the rules, manners, customs, and institutions of the country. This subjection would, therefore, entail such courtly rights and exactions as the right of presentation, the right of the *régale*, the *appel comme d'abus*, and such other infringements of ecclesiastical power as the Court or the parliaments delighted to exercise. In the wilderness along the St. Lawrence, as Garneau in his History intimates, it would scarcely be expected that the courtly customs of the Gallican Church could have much application. The reader will appreciate, however, that in any discussion concerning the status of the Church in Canada, a reference to the Church of France may be most material. At the same time it is to be remembered that so far as "establishments" are concerned, the law of England is, that in any of her colonies the English Church is in the same situation as any other religious

¹ This seems to have been the opinion of Doctor Brownson.

body. After a colony has received legislative institutions, the crown has no prerogative to effect the least control over the colonial church; the mother church forms no part of the colonial constitution; and the establishment is not in any way transplanted. The position of the Anglican church, in a British colony, is that of a voluntary association.¹ If this analogy were insisted upon in a case where the French Church was transferred into a colony of France, one would hear less of "establishments" and "liberties" of the Catholic Church in Canada.

There are, therefore, establishments and establishments. A purely civil law that controls the doctrine and the discipline of a church, and manages its affairs just as it does the postal affairs or the customs of the kingdom, no doubt may establish a church or religion in a way that must be conceded to be legal and, probably, constitutional; but it is manifestly a different establishment from that of a church which has its own laws, its own courts, its own undisputed position as an integral part of the constitution; and whose authority and jurisdiction, if not superior to the civil law, are coördinate with it, and admittedly supreme within its own sphere. There is also that milder and uncomplimentary form of establishment of which the civil authority says in effect: We will recognize such or such a church as the established church of this country; just as it might say, we will do business in financial matters with the First National Bank. One cannot help remarking that those who aided in breaking up Christendom have taken low ground for their religions; avoiding a universal head, recourse was at first had to a national or royal supremacy, and after that has been found a failure, every man is and has the right to be the head of his own church. If the right of private judgment is good against the Pope, it ought to be good against the Privy Council. The historical fact is, that the world within a very short period has seen a Christendom with one international head; then national churches with a royal supremacy; and now disestablishment—no church. "The royal supremacy," says Cardinal Manning in one of his most happy remarks on this subject, "has perished by the law of mortality, which consumes all earthly things." It failed in Ireland—penal laws could not enforce it; in Scotland the whole people rose against it. In Canada,² after being shorn of many of its objectionable provisions, it was introduced by the Quebec Act of 1774. After several ineffectual attempts to enforce it, the provision passed through all possible stages of degradation; it was

¹ See *Long v. Gray* [Cape Town Bishop], 1 Moore's Cases, N. S., 411; *Colenso v. Gladstone*, 3 L. R. Eq., 1; *In re Bishop Natal*, 2 Moore's Cases, N. S., 115, deciding these points.

² See article on "The Quebec Act and the Church in Canada" in the October (1885) number of this REVIEW.

overlooked and waived and ignored, and then finally relegated to the limbo of obsolete law. During British rule in Canada, one thing is certain, that the Church of England never was, and is not now, an establishment by law; the Church of Rome, with its Papal supremacy, could not be expected to confine itself under a royal supremacy; it could not have acknowledged two inconsistent and irreconcilable authorities, and, therefore, it has not been an established church in Canada. It may well be the case that it is better known to the law of the land than any other church; that its freedom is guaranteed by treaty and by statute; and that the law of nations must be set at defiance before any abridgment of this freedom can be effected,—a strong and indestructible bulwark against bigotry emanating from any quarter;—but all this falls short of establishment even of the mild character alluded to. It is vastly better than the Establishment.

The Church under French rule must first of all be considered both with regard to the sequence of events and as throwing light on the state of affairs when this country passed into the hands of the English. It will be contended that it was no national or state church that formerly obtained in this country; that there was no transplanting of “liberties” of the French Church; and that from the historical evidences and legal state papers and other documents pertinent to the solution of these questions, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusions.

From the discovery of Canada, or rather from the foundation of Quebec, the spiritual care of the French settlers and of the aborigines was entrusted to the Archbishop of Rouen. Quebec dates back to 1608, and is associated with the name of Champlain. Many other discoverers had touched at several points in the Gulf of St. Lawrence from the time of Jacques Cartier over seventy years before. To Poutrincourt is ascribed the honor of bringing the first missionary, in 1610, to this shore. As appears by the ecclesiastical records in Quebec, on the 12th of June, 1611, two Jesuit Fathers arrived from France to begin the work of implanting the faith in the New World. One of these remained about two years, and then returned to France. His *confrère*, after thirty-five years of missionary life, ended his days peacefully with the people he had come to serve. Not alone, however, during all this time; for in 1615, four Recollects reached Quebec, and every second or third year afterwards new missionaries of these orders reinforced their brethren, as death or other causes thinned their ranks.

The tenth name on the list is Jean de Brébeuf, a martyr in 1649. While not a few are set down as “drowned” or “frozen,” there are over twenty on the same glorious roll with this illustrious Jesuit. Later, many are reported as lost—unheard of. In 1620

the Recollect convent was founded on the St. Croix River; the name was afterwards changed to St. Charles, and five years later the Jesuit establishment of Notre Dame des Anges. The year previous St. Joseph had been chosen patron saint of the country. In 1639 the Ursulines and Hospitallers commenced their labors at Sillery. Within this period is to be found the names of Lalemant and Brébeuf, Maise, Jogues, and other missionaries.

Shortly after Ville Marie (Montreal) was founded, and churches were built there as in Quebec. The Sulpicians arrived, and with them M. de Queylus in his quality as Grand Vicar of the Archbishop of Rouen. In 1658, however, Mgr. de Laval was named Bishop of *Petræ in part. infid.*; and Vicar Apostolic of New France, and the Grand Vicar retired from the country. It was not until 1674 that he was named Bishop of Quebec and immediate suffragan of the Holy See. This was by bull of Clement X., dated 1st of October of that year.

During these fifty years it may be fairly argued that whatever principles of the French national church or of Gallicanism could be imported into New France might have been so imported; that Quebec was ecclesiastically an outlying portion of the Archdiocese of Rouen, and that whatever that was, Quebec was. But now a bishop was to be appointed, and that was regarded then, as it may be now, the test question, or deciding whether Gallican or Ultramontane principles (so to call them) were to be transplanted into the French colony.

On this important matter few writers will be more readily accepted, at all events by Protestants, than the historian Parkman. In his "French Régime," he thus narrates this crisis of ecclesiastical affairs:

"Two great parties divided the Catholics of France—the Gallican, or national party, and the Ultramontane, or papal party. . . . Hence they claimed for him [the Pope] the right of nominating bishops in France. This had anciently been exercised by assemblies of the French clergy, but in the reign of Francis I. the king and the Pope had combined to wrest it from them by the Concordat of Bologna. Under this compact, which was still in force, the Pope appointed French bishops on the nomination of the king, a plan which displeased the Gallicans and did not satisfy the Ultramontanes.

"The Jesuits then, as now, were the most forcible exponents of ultramontane principles. . . . In the question of papal supremacy, as in most things else, Laval was of one mind with them.

"Those versed in such histories will not be surprised to learn that when he received the royal nomination, humility would not permit him to accept it; nor that, being urged, he at length

bowed in resignation, still protesting his unworthiness. Nevertheless, the royal nomination did not take effect. The Ultramontanes outflanked both the king and the Gallicans, and by adroit strategy made the new prelate completely a creature of the Papacy.

"Instead of appointing him Bishop of Quebec in accordance with the royal initiative, the Pope made him his Vicar Apostolic for Canada, a country of infidel savages, which was excluded from the concordat and under his [the Pope's] jurisdiction pure and simple. The Gallicans were enraged.

"The Archbishop of Rouen vainly opposed, and the parliaments of Rouen and of Paris vainly protested. The Papal party prevailed. The king, or, rather, Mazarin, gave his consent, subject to certain conditions, the chief of which was an oath of allegiance; and Laval, Grand Vicar Apostolic, decorated with the title of Bishop of Petràa, sailed for his wilderness diocese in the spring of 1659."¹

Slight reference need here be made to other facts which go to the support of this view. The unfortunate episode of Abbé Queylus made it only the more apparent that the "Papal party," as Parkman would call it, and not the "Gallican party," was at the head of the Church in Canada.

The Abbé had obtained bulls from Rome in regard to the curacy at Montreal. These disturbed the mind of the Vicar Apostolic, and he wrote to the Pope regarding the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Rouen. The result was not ambiguous.

"The Holy See annulled the obnoxious bulls; the Archbishop of Rouen renounced his claims, and Queylus found his position untenable. Seven years later, when Laval was on a visit to France, a reconciliation was brought about between them. The former Vicar of the Archbishop of Rouen made his submission to the Vicar of the Pope, and returned to Canada as a missionary. Laval's triumph was complete, to the joy of the Jesuits, silent, if not idle, spectators of the tedious quarrel."²

To Mgr. Laval must be ascribed the position of father of the Canadian Church. In 1663 he founded the seminary of Quebec, which was confirmed by letters patent from Louis XIV., and three years later he consecrated the parish church of Quebec. On the occasion of his visit to France in 1674, he was named Bishop of Quebec and immediate suffragan of the Holy See, and the reve-

¹ Abbé Faillon gives the documents in full.

² De Talon says: "L'Ecclesiastique est composé d'un Eveque, ayant le titre de Pêtrée, *in partibus infidelium*, et se servant du caractère et de l'autorité de Vicaire-Apostolique. . . . En lieu de soupçonner que la pratique, dans laquelle ils sont qui n'ont pas bien conformé à celle des Ecclesiastiques de l'Ancienne France, a pour but de partager l'autorité temporelle qui jusqu'au temps de l'arrivée des troupes du Roi en Canada, residait principalement en leur personnes." The extract made by Parkman is all that is material in these papers.

nues of the Abbey of Meaubec were united to the diocese of Quebec. In 1684 he established a chapter in his episcopal city, and four years later retired, leaving the Abbé de St. Valier as his successor. On the day after Mgr. Laval had retired, his successor was consecrated, though the bulls for his appointment and the letters patent confirming it had been issued some months prior to that time. These letters, issued in 1687, confirm the creation of the diocese of Quebec.

St. Valier had been Almoner to the king when Laval went to France for a successor in 1684, and it is ascribed to him that he tried to undo much of the good his predecessor had effected in opposing the kingly pretensions.¹ The mere fact of his being almoner suggests a favorite of the king; on him devolved the right of advising the crown as to the nomination to bishoprics. In 1685, two ordinances were passed which deserve to be noticed. In the commission to Denonville the religion of the governor is for the first time specially mentioned, it being required that he profess "*la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine.*" It is significant that Colbert died the preceding year. In March, 1685, an ordinance issued in which "*le roi veut y maintenir la discipline de l'Eglise catholique apostolique et romaine.*"

In 1695, during the episcopacy of St. Valier, the jurisdiction concerning ecclesiastical matters was thus defined: "*La connaissance des causes concernant les sacrements, les vœux de religion, l'office divin, la discipline ecclésiastique, et autres purement spirituelles, appartiendra aux juges d'église. Enjoignons à nos officiers et même à nos cours de parlements, de leur en laisser, et même de leur en renvoyer la connaissance, sans prendre aucune juridiction, ni connaissance des affaires de cette nature, si ce n'est qu'il y eut appel comme d'abus interjeté en nos dites cours, de quelques jugements, ordonnances ou procédures faites sur ce sujet, par les juges d'église, ou qu'il s'agit de succession, ou autres effets civils à l'occasion desquels on traiterait de l'état des personnes décédées ou de celui de leurs enfants.*"

On the death of St. Valier, in 1727, a question arose as to whom should be entrusted the conduct of his obsequies. Mgr. de Mor-nay, some dozen years before that date, had been appointed coadjutor to Bishop St. Valier, under the title of Bishop of Eumenea in Phrygia. He had taken up his residence at Cambrai, and, as a matter of fact, never came to Canada. One of his first acts, however, after his succession to the See of Quebec, in May, 1728, was the nomination of Mgr. Dosquet as his coadjutor. On the death

¹ It is said that the aim of this bishop was to place the Church in Canada on the footing of the Church in France; but, as Parkman says on this, nature as well as Bishop Laval threw difficulties in the way. He effected nothing.

of St. Valier the Quebec chapter assembled and appointed M. Bollard as Vicar-General, in spite of the fact that Mgr. Mornay exercised that charge. A claim was put forward by M. de Lotbinière, as archdeacon, and a lengthy ordinance appeared under the direction of the intendant, Dupuy. He was a lawyer of the Gallican school, whose great ambition was to make the superior council at Quebec a reduced copy of the parliament at Paris.¹ With great prolixity, an ordinance of the 4th of January, 1728, prescribed the proceedings of the bishop's funeral. Two days later, a canon of the Cathedral caused a *mandement* to be read in all the churches protesting against this intervention of the civil power, whereupon the incensed intendant on the following day issued another ordinance which bears exactly on the question in hand. It is in the true Gallican spirit:

“L'Église étant dans l'État, et non l'État dans l'Église, faisant partie de l'État, sans lequel elle ne peut subister, les Écclesiastiques, d'ailleurs, étant si peu les maîtres de se soustraire un seul moment à la justice du Prince que Sa Majesté enjoint à ses Juges, par les Ordonnances du Royaume, de les y contraindre par la saisie de leurs revenus temporels, n'étant nécessaire, pour en convaincre tout

¹ As to the nature of the Parliament of Paris, hear what Count de Maistre says of it: “Protestant dans le seizième siècle, frondeur et Janséniste dans le dix-septième, philosophe enfin et républicain dans les dernières années de sa vie, trop souvent le Parlement s'est montré en contradiction avec les véritables maximes fondamentales de l'État. Le germe Calviniste nourri dans ce grand corps devint bien plus dangereux lorsque son essence changea de mom et s'appela Jansénisme. Alors les consciences étaient mises à l'aise par une hérésie qui disait: je n'existe pas; le venin atteignit même ces grands noms de la magistrature que les nations étrangères pouvaient envier à la France. Alors, toutes les erreurs, même les erreurs ennemies entre elles, étaient toujours d'accord contre la vérité, la nouvelle philosophie dans les parlements s'allia au Jansénisme contre Rome. Alors le Parlement devint en totalité un corps véritablement anti-catholique, et tel que sans l'instinct royal de la maison de Bourbon et sans l'influence aristocratique du clergé (il n'en avait plus d'autre) la France eût été conduite infailliblement à un schisme absolu.

“Encouragés par la faiblesse d'une souveraineté agonisante, les magistrats ne gardèrent plus de mesure: ils régentèrent les évêques, ils saisirent leur temporel; ils appelèrent comme d'abus d'un institut religieux devenu français depuis deux siècles, et le déclarèrent, de leur chef, anti-français, anti-social, et même impie, sans s'arrêter un instant devant un concile œcuménique qui l'avait déclaré pieux devant le souverain Pontife qui répétait la même décision devant l'Eglise Gallicane, enfin debout devant eux, et conjurant l'autorité royale d'empêcher cette funeste violation de tous les principes.

“Pour détruire un ordre célèbre ils s'appuyèrent d'un livre accusant qu'ils avaient fait fabriquer eux-mêmes et dont les auteurs eussent été condamnés aux galères sans difficulté dans tout pays où les juges n'auraient pas été complices. Ils firent brûler des mandements d'évêques, et même, si l'on ne m'a pas trompé, des bulles du Pape, par la main du bourreau. Changeant une lettre provinciale en dogme de l'Église et en loi de l'État, on les vit décider qu'il n'y avait point hérésie dans l'Église qui anathématisait cette hérésie; ils finirent par violer les tabernacles et en arracher l'Eucharistie pour l'envoyer au milieu de quatre baïonnettes, chez le malade obstiné qui, ne pouvant la recevoir, avait la coupable audace de se la faire adjuger.”

le peuple de cette colonie, inviolablement attachée au culte dû a Dieu et à l'obéissance due au Roi par l'exprès commandement de Dieu, que de lui donner connaissance ainsi que nous allons le faire de la déclaration publique, que les *Evêques de France, assemblés à la tête du clergé, ont donné, le dix-neuf Mars de l'année mil six cent quatre-vingt deux*; laquelle déclaration porte en propres termes, que Saint Pierre et ses successeurs, Vicaires de Jesus Christ, et que toute l'Eglise même, n'ont reçu de puissance de Dieu que sur les choses spirituelles et qui concernent le salut, et non point sur les choses temperelles et civiles: Jésus Christ nous apprenant lui-même que son royaume n'est pas de ce monde, et, en un autre endroit, qu'il faut rendre a César ce qui est a César, et qu'il s'en faut tenir a ce précepte de l'Apotre Saint Paul, que toutes personnes soient soumises aux puissances des Rois, car il n'y a point de puissance qui ne vienne de Dieu, c'est pourquoi celui qui s'oppose à la puissance des souverains, résiste a l'ordre de Dieu dans les choses qui concernent le temporel.

“ Ce sont ces vérités reconnues et annoncées par un clergé aussi auguste que l'est le clergé de France, dont les prélats et ecclésiastiques qui le composent, ont toute la science et la capacité convenable pour ne se point tromper eux-mêmes et ne point induire les peuples en erreur, aussi bien dans les affaires du gouvernement et de l'État que dans les plus grandes vérités de la religion, ce sont, disons-nous, ces principes qu'il convenait d'apprendre ici au peuple, plutôt que d'abuser de cette chaire de vérité où l'on ne doit prêcher que l'obéissance due à Dieu et au Roi, pour faire de la part des dits chanoines et chapitre un acte d'obéissance formelle à la puissance du roi et à l'autorité légitime; c'est donc pour aller au devant de ce désordre et mettre le conseil supérieur en état de punir les coupables que nous ordonnons qu'il sera informé contre le Sieur de Tounancourt, Chanoine de la Cathédrale, et autres, de la publication du prétendu mandement et manifeste, par devant le Sieur André de Leigne, Lieutenant-General, civil et criminel, en qualité de nôtre subdélégué à la requête du Sieur Hiche, que nous avons nommé en cela Procureur-Général de notre commission.

“ Faisons de très-expresses inhibitions et défenses aux prétendus Vicaires-Generaux du Chapitre de Québec, d'envoyer le dit mandement et manifeste pour être publié en aucune Eglise de la colonie, sous peine de la saisie de leurs revenus temporels et autres peines de droit.

“ Faisons pareillement défense aux curés et missionnaires des Eglises paroissiales du Canada de faire la publication du mandement et manifeste d'aucun autre qui émane des dits prétendus vicaires-généraux à qui le Conseil Supérieur a fait défense de prendre cette qualité et d'en faire les fonctions sous peine contre

les dits curés et missionnaires d'être déclarés désobéissants aux ordres du Roi et à justice et sous peine de la saisie du revenu temporel de leurs curés, etc."

If these ordinances of the council had taken effect, or had not been questioned, they would be strong evidence of the existence and toleration, the actual establishment indeed, of the "liberties" of the Gallican Church in Canada. But the governor, M. de Beauharnois, took the most decided stand against the action of the intendant, Dupuy; he annulled the obnoxious ordinance and had his own decrees for their reversal executed with the aid of the military. Cardinal Fleury, at home, had procured the dismissal of Dupuy; and although the governor may have acted in a high-handed way, as Mr. Garneau says, the ordinance of the 17th of September, annulling the proceedings of Dupuy, was confirmed by Maurepas, the French Secretary of State. Mr. Garneau thinks that the governor took sides more strongly in favor of the clergy than ever his predecessor took against them. But unquestionably it was a critical time in the history of the Church. Garneau's account is, to say the least, meagre, and not at all marked by the calmness that should pervade the treatment of such delicate subjects amongst his countrymen. Mr. Doutre is forced to say: "Le conseil se trouva ainsi en opposition au gouverneur et à la majorité du clergé. L'immoral Louis XV., de son côté, pour donner la change, se faisait servir par des cardinaux et donnait au clergé dans le royaume une immense influence. L'Intendant Dupuy, voyant défaillir le conseil, donna sa démission pour ne pas se voir retirer les faveurs du prince." This great and indisputable fact remains. In 1728, in *La Nouvelle France*, the declaration of 1682 was expressly referred to and relied upon in an official State document; and subsequently, within the same year, and as part of the same public affair, this document was officially, publicly, and with unusual notoriety, annulled and rendered void. The French authorities approved of this course.

The history of the declaration is in perfect accord with this view. It was never registered or put in force in Canada. This cannot be disputed. In the two large volumes compiled under the direction of the Parliament of Canada, in 1801, no such registration can be found; nay more, no official or other state paper from France has the most remote reference to it. It can be pretty confidently asserted that no official or other state paper in Canada, except the one already referred to as having been cancelled, is to be found. If not registered, then, according to the French law, it would be void. "It did not require registering," says Mr. Doutre, "because it did not emanate from the king." It is true that the declaration did not emanate from the king as a state paper,—it has been traced

pretty clearly to Colbert,—but the edict directing that the doctrines of the four propositions should be taught and maintained in the schools of the kingdom, was an edict emanating from the king. Mr. Doutre feels the weakness of a want of registration, however, and adds: “The most incontestable proof that it is possible to give that the bishops of New France are conformed to the declaration of 1682, is in the edict of installation of Mgr. Pontbriand.”

That admission, in view of what we have seen, will bring us safely down to 1714 without any Gallican liberties in Canada. Mr. Doutre is the great champion of the Gallican Church, and if there is anything in favor of his theory until Bishop Pontbriand's time, it is likely he made the most of it.

The See of Quebec was declared from its foundation to be immediately dependent on the Holy See. The claim of nomination was no special feature of the Gallican liberties, it was exercised in Europe in ancient times, and exists to-day.¹ Bishop Laval was no Gallican, and was opposed to Gallican principles; Bishop Saint Valier was necessarily something of a royalist, but was unable to nationalize the Church; he could not even establish an irremovable curé. We have seen the defeat of Gallicanism after his death—a defeat where success, if possible, was the most likely. During the episcopates of Mornay, Dosquet, and L'Aube-Rivière, there is no sign of any royal, or national, or Gallican tendency; but we are told that the installation of the last bishop under the French régime established the most “incontestable proof of the recognition of the four articles of 1682.” The first bishop was confessedly not within these articles, as his installation was many years before they were drawn up—the last one, it seems, is the only one possible to be accounted as Gallican.

Bishops in French times, and later under English sway, were royal counsellors as well as spiritual heads. They therefore took an oath such as privy counsellors at this day take. If Bishop

¹ Archbishop Spalding, in his *Miscellanea*, says: “Princes never had the right of nomination to bishoprics without the consent and concurrence of the Church. The thirtieth canon of those called Apostolic—believed by the learned to exhibit pretty accurately the discipline of the first three centuries of the Church—pronounced sentences of deposition against bishops who received their Sees from princes. The fourth canon of the great Council of Nice, held in 325, regulates the manner of appointing bishops by the prelates of the province, or by at least three of them, without even alluding to any right of the people or of princes in the matter. The twenty-second canon of the Eighth General Council, held in Constantinople in 870, goes still further and pronounces an anathema against any lay prince who would interfere in the “election or promotion of any patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop so as to prevent its canonical freedom.” Many other authorities could be produced to prove that the claim set up by the princes of the 11th century not only had no sanction from the Church, but was in the very face of all its rights and laws. By being liberal to the Church, temporal princes acquired no right to enslave it, and to introduce into its bosom the feudal on the ruins of the canon law.

Pontbriand, or any other bishop before or since his time, took an oath with any reference to Gallican liberties, or adverted even to the existence of such things, there would be an argument worth considering. Now, what are the facts about Bishop Pontbriand? After the king had seen the "bulls and apostolic provisions for the bishopric of Quebec," as the installation document says, "and not being able to discover anything in them, either derogating from our laws, indult, concession, and concordat between the Holy See and our kingdom, or from the privileges, franchises, and liberties of the French Church, we have admitted the said bishop to take an oath of fidelity that he owes us by reason of the said bishopric, as it appears by a certificate," etc.

Now all this is manifestly in favor of the view we are presenting. As to the bishopric of Quebec, the bulls and apostolic provision for its erection were issued on the 1st of October, 1674, and the negotiations for obtaining a bishopric for Canada began in 1657. The king wrote to the Pope frequently about it, and he was waiting, as the official documents show, until "il aura plû à notre Saint Père le Pape d'y en établir un."

Mgr. Laval was consecrated Bishop of Petræa in 1659, and the delay was really due to the fact, as Parkman tells, whether Laval should be attached to the Gallican archbishop of Rouen, or should be directly under the authority of the Pope. Between 1659 and 1674 Mgr. Laval was named Vicar Apostolic, which, as every one knows, is an office immediately depending on the Holy See. When the bulls were published in 1674, this fact was recited in them.

Now, in 1741, when Bishop Pontbriand received the mitre, he received it both with reference to the king and the Pope, exactly as did Bishop Laval in 1674; and this is not only the meaning, but the precise wording of the installation. Further, if the articles of 1682 were in force, either in France or in Canada, if no reference were made to them, it would be strange, but it might pass. When, however, the king says that "the bulls and apostolic provisions of the diocese of Quebec are in accord with the laws, indult, concession, and concordat" between France and the Holy See, it is inconsistent with these words to suppose the existence of the articles of 1682, which had been, as long as they were in force, directly opposed to the concordat of 1515, and to all the relations with the Holy See.¹

¹ The oath of Bishop Pontbriand is as follows: "Sire, Je, Henri-Marie Du Breil de Pontbriand, Evêque de Québec, jure le très-saint et sacré nom de Dieu et promets à Votre Majesté que je lui serai, tant que je vivrai, fidèle sujet et serviteur, que je procurerai de tout mon pouvoir le bien et le service de son Etat, que je ne me trouverai en aucun conseil, dessein, ni entreprise au préjudice d'iceux, et que, s'il en vient

This document is, therefore, evidence against those who contend for the Gallican character of the Church in Canada; but even if it were the contrary, it has been referred to here for this reason: it is the only document in force referred to in the edicts, ordinances, *arrêts*, etc., in France or in Canada, in ecclesiastical or "Gallican" state papers, in which the phrase, "*Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*," appears. The state paper drawn up by Dupuy in 1728, and already referred to, relies on the articles of 1682, but was annulled. In no one of the commissions to governors or intendants is there any reference to the Gallican Church. In the ordinances or patents respecting the bishops, the seminary, the Jesuits, or other religious bodies, there is not a word pointing to any Gallican Church or any special customs, liberties, or privileges.¹

The state papers drawn up in reference to the cession are further evidence of the position for which we are contending. The VIth article of the capitulation of Quebec provided that "*la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine sera conservé*;" the XXVIIth article of the Capitulation at Montreal makes provision that "*la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine subistera en son entier*," and then the Treaty of Paris in its IVth clause secures "*la religion catholique . . . selon les rites de l'Eglise de Rome*." Attorney-general Marriot, who went very minutely into the whole question, gave it as his strong opinion that the Church in Canada was the Church of Rome without any restrictions of the Gallican Church. He wrote at the time, and at the express request of the government of England. He was employed to draft a constitution for the "new" subjects of His Majesty George III., and he was regarded as one of the most learned doctors of the law in the kingdom.

The Church, then, in Canada began under the protection of the Archbishop of Rouen, and for nearly fifty years was under his charge. A vicar apostolic was then put over the country; the archbishop lost all control of the ecclesiastical affairs, and Quebec became immediately dependent on the Holy See. Prior to this time Cardinal Richelieu, an adherent of the Roman as opposed to the Gallican tenets, took charge of the colony.²

quelque chose à ma connaissance, je le ferai savoir à Votre Majesté; ainsi, Dieu me soit en aide, et ses Saints Evangiles par moi touchés."

[Signé] H. M. DU BREIL DE PONTBRIAND,
Evêque de Québec.

¹ In a series of questions put for the decision of the king in 1692, on some disciplinary matters as to precedence in the Church, an answer is given to one to the effect that the case be governed "*par les usages de l'Eglise de France*." It is needless to say that it would be unfair to draw a general deduction from phrases like "*l'Eglise de France*," or "*l'Eglise Gallicane*," when used in a sense of certain customs obtaining in France and necessarily introduced here.

² Ranke says: "Richelieu found it advisable, on the whole, to attach himself as closely as possible to the Papacy; in the disputes between the Roman and Gallican doctrines, he now adhered to the Roman and abandoned the Gallican tenets."

In the third quarter of the century the diocese was erected and placed under Roman as opposed to Gallican control. From 1682, the date of the Gallican articles, until 1693, when they were annulled, no edict is to be found transplanting them into Canada, and no French or Canadian edict ever referred to them as being in force in this country. The Pope, it is said, claimed that it did not apply to a country like Canada. The Superior Council at Quebec has no reference to it. In 1728 an attorney-general attempted to make it appear that it was French law, and founded an edict upon it, but the edict was annulled, and he was dismissed from his position. Finally, in 1741, the last bishop who owed allegiance to France was installed with special reference to the fact that the diocese of Quebec was created by the bulls and apostolic provisions of Clement X. in 1674. In 1763 Canada passed out of French control, and in the capitulation at Montreal, some years before, the French representatives asked that the nomination of French bishops, etc., be reserved to the French king, and the absurd request was very naturally refused.

The rights of the *régale* never could have any application to Canada except as to the presentation, which has been a law at all times in France—so long as the Church has existed there. How was this in Canada? Every bishop after Laval had his coadjutor, who was appointed *in partibus infidelium*, just as Laval himself originally had been. The consent of the king was superadded. There was never a vacancy in point of fact, and there were no revenues for the king to seize upon.¹ These are the three features of the *régale*, and it cannot be intelligently argued that the right applied to Canada. It did not arise in France until after 1670.

Then the *appel comme d'abus* does not apply to Canada. Sir Robert Phillimore, in giving judgment in the Guibord case, on the contention that the Court of Queen's Bench, created in 1794, possessed the power of enforcing the privileges of the Gallican Church by proceeding in the nature of an *appel comme d'abus*, says: "Considering the altered circumstances of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, the non-existence of any recognized ecclesiastical courts in that province, such as those in France, which it was the office of an *appel comme d'abus* to control and keep within their jurisdiction, and the absence of any mention in the recent code of procedure for Lower Canada of such a proceeding, their lordships would feel considerable difficulty in affirming the latter of these

¹ The colony was so poor, and the church revenues so insufficient, that the king had to defray the expenses connected with procuring the bulls from Rome in Bishop Laval's time. When Canada fell into the hands of the English, the government granted an annuity to the bishop to maintain him in suitable dignity. A vacant benefice in Canada would not afford any *régale*. The bishops had the patronage by a royal arrêt, dated 27th March, 1699.

propositions." The ordinance of 1695, set out above, would seem to be decisive of this question.

In ordinary language, this means that there was no such appeal ; that there cannot be an appeal where there is no court to be appealed from. His lordship then proceeded to show that a number of cases decided in Lower Canada, supposed to be appeals of this nature, were not so in reality. And one hundred years before this judgment of the Privy Council, Chief Justice Hey reported to the home government that so far as appeals from the ecclesiastical to the civil tribunals were concerned, "no such thing as ecclesiastical courts existed in the province." The governor-general, Carlton, acquiesced in this view. However it may be as to the existence of appealable courts, the position was taken that the tribunal capable of entertaining such appeals was not the Superior Council at Quebec, and this position was upheld on a reference to the French court. The ordinance of 1695, already cited, expressly enjoins that, except in the case of appeal to the courts of parliament, the civil authorities were not to interfere with the judges of the Church in matters of a spiritual nature. That the courts of the parliament of Paris might have been able to entertain an appeal, in virtue of this *ordonnance*, from the judges of the Church, may be fairly argued ; but by every canon or legal construction of a written law, there could be no appeal to any other tribunal, and so no appeal to the Superior Council at Quebec.

In former articles of this REVIEW, the writer has discussed the "Treaty of Paris," and the "Quebec Act," making reference to such incidental matters as seemed to throw light upon these important documents. The order in which these studies have been presented to the reader may be open to some objection ; but it is to be hoped that a little assistance has been given to whosoever takes up the task of writing the history of the Church in Canada. Such a work remains yet to be done ; some general histories of Canada, of course, there are ; but in these, even when written by Catholics, and where the Church necessarily forms an important part, much must be taken with caution, and not a little rejected altogether. It is to be regretted that, with one or two notable exceptions, non-Catholic writers have done themselves no credit by the suppression of what is unquestionably the truth, and by the suggestion of what is undeniably falsehood. It is no part of the present writer's task to correct, or to try to correct, every erroneous impression or unfair statement of those who have preceded him in the consideration of the questions here suggested ; it was deemed sufficient to put forward the one view of the case and allow it to rest on such evidence as properly decides the questions in dispute. That evidence speaks for itself ; and if the reader thinks it points to other conclusions, he is welcome to his own opinion.

CATHOLICITY IN ITALY.¹

A SINGLE fact, taken up by chance from among those which are of frequent and almost daily occurrence in Italy, and even in Rome, may serve to introduce to American readers the very important topic with which this paper deals. Yesterday—Septuagesima Sunday—at half-past one o'clock of the afternoon, a large and select audience assembled in the great hall of the Roman College, the once glorious school of the Society of Jesus, to hear a distinguished member of the Italian Parliament deliver a lecture on what must have seemed to his admirers a most interesting subject. Around the lecturer's chair was a circle of illustrious *Italianissime* gentlemen and ladies. There were Mancini, the ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, who won himself such unenviable notoriety at the time of the obsequies of Pius IX., in the summer of 1881, and two years ago in the confiscation of the Propaganda property; Zanardelli, ex-Minister of Justice, Cairoli, Spaventa, Pianciani, Sbarbaro, Miceli, and others whose names the *Gazzetta d'Italia* omits to mention. The rest of the audience was made up of the anti-clerical clubs of Rome, of the youth who are mis-taught in the institutions which formerly composed the Papal University of the Sapienza and the Roman College itself, in papal times the Gregorian University.

The lecturer was the honorable Domenico Berti, and the subject was—The Life and Work of Giordano Bruno—the great apostle of atheism in Italy. The subject-matter and its treatment were quite in harmony with the ideas and sentiments of the audience, for the illustrious statesmen present, and the *moltissime signore*, the crowd of ladies, applauded frequently and vehemently.

So, in the great hall of the world-wide renowned Catholic school in which Leo XIII. was educated, he had the grief to learn that on

¹ [It may be noticed that here we present a second article, in this number of the REVIEW, on the relation of the State to the Church in Italy. The fact that these two contributions came to us almost simultaneously is a striking illustration of the renewed interest that is being taken in this question. Both papers were written in entire independence of each other, one by an American priest resident in the Eternal City; the other, by an American bishop, making close observation during his visit *ad limina apostolorum*, and, some considerable time after his return home, putting his recollections and impressions in the shape in which they appear in our opening article. Necessarily, both, to a great extent, cover the same ground; but each adds greatly to the interest the other awakens in the reader, who cannot fail to remark the different ways by which they arrive at practically the same conclusion. The Roman question will remain an open one until it is settled in favor of the Pope, of the Church, and of justice.—ED. REVIEW.]

Septuagesima Sunday, the beginning of the solemn penitential season, a high official held up to the admiration of the men and women of Italy, of the youth of Rome in particular, a man whose name would never have survived among posterity but for the evil preëminence gained him by his pestilential doctrines, his life dedicated to the propagation of blasphemy, and his evil end.

The *Syndaco*, or Mayor of Rome, Duke Leopold Torlonia, a nephew of the great Prince Alexander Torlonia, buried two weeks ago, not being able to preside at this ungodly assemblage on the Lord's day, sent one of his associates in office.

And so the Sabbath is now consecrated in Rome—in the name of Italy, of patriotism, of progress, of civilization—to the unhallowed work of undoing all that so many ages of Christian culture and piety had effected; of discrediting within sight of the hill where St. Peter was crucified, and of the great temple beneath whose dome he and his brother Apostle repose in death, the very doctrines which they had sealed with their blood, the very notion itself of a God Creator and Revealer!

But this is only a part of a system. Wherever in Italy there has existed in the past a personage noted for his hatred of the Papacy, or his prominence as a teacher of error, or a corrupter of souls by false doctrines or immoral writings, there it is now the rule, sanctioned by the men in power, to hold a solemn festival in honor of the man. So happened it with Arnold of Brescia, so with Socinus in Siena; so made they capital in 1866 of the centenary of Dante's birth to hold a carnival of anti-Papal exultation at Ravenna.

And why do we quote these facts? Simply to point to the clever and successful strategy followed in Italy and in Rome by the enemies of the Christian name to blot out from the souls and the lives of the people of Italy the last remnants of religious belief and practice, and to do their work so effectually that the reconversion of the Italian people to the belief in Christ and the practice of His religion will be a task incomparably more difficult than that which the disciples of Peter and Paul had to face on the morning following that memorable 29th of June, in the year of Christ 66, when Nero fancied he had killed Christianity with the sword which beheaded Paul, and made it eternally odious by the cross on which Peter died, head downwards, on the Janicule.

This is a grave assertion. But do you want seriously to become acquainted with the agencies which are now at work in Rome and throughout Italy to pervert the minds and hearts of her people? Do you wish to know what a plentiful harvest the enemy of God and man has reaped from the seed sown so plentifully and cultivated with such abundant force of laborers and such inexhaustible resources during the last thirty years or more? Then we shall

study together a few facts and figures whose eloquence and irresistible logic will need no comment of ours.

When we speak of "Catholicity in Italy," we mean, first of all, to show clearly, and beyond all possibility of gainsaying the truth of our statements, that the Catholic religion, *as such*, has suffered enormously during the interval just mentioned; more than that, the very basis of religious faith of any sort, the notion of a God, and that of any kind of *spiritual substance*, is being destroyed in the minds of all the youth of Italy—the immense majority—frequenting the public or government schools.

Of course, we, as Catholics, know on what Divine promises is founded our belief in the indestructibility of the Church, and the imperishable nature of the deposit of revealed truth committed to her. When, therefore, we speak of actual or probable decadence among any one people or in any one land, even in Italy, we are not to be understood as saying that Catholicity is in danger of perishing from the face of the earth. We simply mean to say that causes like to those which extinguished for centuries the Christian faith in Jerusalem and in Palestine, in Asia Minor and in Greece, all along the shores of Northern Africa from Alexandria to Tunis, and which almost obliterated Catholicity from Great Britain and portions of the European continent, are now at work in France and in Italy, aided by the experience of the past and the means of propagandism furnished by the present age. Will they succeed in effecting the same results? That we do not, cannot, say. The secret of the future belongs to the Eternal God.

We are only dealing with the present, and calculating what anti-Catholic and anti-Christian propagandism has accomplished within less than the last half-century.

The Catholic Church, as such, reposes on distinctive doctrines and institutions, without which she would be easily confounded with any of the denominations claiming to be called Christian and claiming even to be called "Catholic." We know that in the United States the Episcopal Church, in the British Empire the Church of England (and so of the Disestablished Church of Ireland), lays claim to Catholicity, with what little right we need not pause to show. So do the Jansenists of Holland; so did, within the last decade, the "Old Catholic" followers of Döllinger, whose church and pretensions have vanished like a short but evil dream. They sought fraternity with the "Catholic" or "Orthodox" churches of the East, and got more contempt than content from Greek, and Russian, and Nestorian.

But the Eastern as well as the Western pseudo-Catholics lack at least one essential condition of Catholicity—submission to and communion with the Chair of Peter, the Holy Roman Catholic

Church. This the Greek Church and her offshoots enjoyed before the Photian schism; this they tried to regain permanently in the fifteenth century, in the time of the Council of Florence. This submission and communion were again marred by prejudices and passions of race and country; and this, it is to be hoped, as the nations are brought into closer social and commercial intercourse, the Orthodox churches of the East will once more recover. Toward this reconciliation more than one great and successful step has been taken during the present Pontificate.

But, apart from the acknowledgment of the divinely established supremacy and infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiffs, successors of Peter, and from the necessity of communion with the See and Church of Rome, the Centre of Catholic Unity, the Protestants of Western Europe and the English-speaking world reject many of the doctrines which the Catholic Church teaches as necessary and belonging to Revealed Truth.

The Greek and several of the other Eastern churches have retained many of the institutions which the whole Catholic world regards as the necessary offspring of Catholic doctrine and practice, the feeders of Catholic life, the great agents and organs of the Church's life and action—such as the religious orders. Monasticism has ever held its ground in the East, vegetating within the limits assigned to it by the civil government or the local extension of each individual "orthodox" community, but, like each of these churches, having no expansive vitality of its own, no tendency to the Catholicity in space as well as in name.

The Protestant sects, in spite of a few sporadic and spasmodic efforts at organizing religious or monastic orders on the model of those belonging to the Catholic Church, have been, from their origin, too much opposed to them in principle, profession, and practice, to go heartily into the work of founding them or to find a hearty co-operation among their members.

So, confessedly, to confine ourselves to these two heads, the two great characteristic institutions of Catholicity in Italy, the Papacy and monastic life, have suffered from the anti-Christian revolution during the last forty years—during the period of Piedmontese usurpation, particularly,—all the loss and destruction which moral agencies and unscrupulous political might could inflict upon them.

What the Papacy has suffered and is still suffering at the hands of the present political rulers of Rome, it would seem perfectly needless to relate here. All Catholics are, or ought to be, familiar with the nature of the wrong done to the Vicar of Christ, with its enormity, and with its extent. But all are not; and among Catholics, even professedly good Catholics, or who believe themselves such, there are not a few who, before the entry of the Piedmontese

into Rome, went with the current of popular and anti-Catholic prejudice, and hesitated not to declare that the abolition of the Pope's temporal sovereignty would be a blessing—relieving the Church in every land of the constant reproach cast on Catholics about the scandalous mal-administration of the Roman States, and the seeming contradiction between the state, the pomp, the extravagance of the Roman court, and the simplicity, the poverty, the self-denial, the freedom from all worldly and political care, which became the sacred character and ministry of the successor of Peter, the poor fisherman of Galilee, of the imitator and follower of Paul, the tent-maker, who worked with his own hands to earn his bread and the bread of his associates in the Apostleship.

Who among us that has not heard such sentiments uttered again and again?

And since Victor Emmanuel took possession of the Quirinal and planted his sentries outside the very threshold of the Vatican, have we not heard it frequently said—do we not hear it still—that Rome is just as well governed as under the Popes, and that inside and outside the once Papal States religion is no worse off than before, and that the people are infinitely better off?

Never was error greater; never was illusion less pardonable in men who care anything for what is most vital in their religion, or who would not like to be called ignorant of facts the most obvious and important.

It is vital to the interests of the entire Catholic world, of the entire civilized world, that the Papacy, being what it claims to be, has ever shown itself to be, what it is still and ever must be, the living, abiding, imperishable embodiment of Christ, teaching, governing, leading the human race to eternal life, that it should be free—absolutely, visibly, confessedly free to fulfil its divine mission, able and free to provide the means to carry it on efficiently, secured by the will of all and in the interest of all, to suffer no curtailment of these necessary means, no obstacle imposed by a superior earthly power in the use of these means, or the discharge of an office which is identical with that of Christ Himself on earth.

It is childish to compare the conditions, the exigencies, the labors, and wide, universal action of the Pontificate, when looked up to and depended upon for light and guidance and all manner of spiritual support and comfort by *two hundred or three hundred millions* of Catholics, to the feeble beginnings of the Christian society under Nero. Peter and Paul, and their fellow-Apostles, went by order of the Master to preach the Gospel to the poor, to descend to the level of the sore and bruised of heart, of the slave and the oppressed, and the despairing of every clime, and to heal their wounded spirit by the unction of Christ crucified. Through

them they were to leaven the oppressing and ruling classes, and the whole mass of that idolatrous, sensuous, heathen world. The noble convert, Philemon, to whom Paul addressed from the Mamertine prison his exquisitely touching epistle in favor of the converted slave, Onesimus, was the representative type of the Roman, the civilized world, to be brought to the feet of Christ, just as Onesimus, who had been so useful to the Apostle in his need, and had helped him in his ministry, was the type of that glorious world of laboring men, workingmen, whom the Apostles and their successors were lifting up, enlightening, sanctifying, and employing to convert their masters and to change the face of the earth.

"Though I have much confidence in Christ Jesus to command thee that which is to the purpose, for charity sake I rather beseech thee, whereas thou art such an one, as Paul an old man, and now a prisoner also of Jesus Christ,—I beseech thee for my son whom I have begotten in my bonds, Onesimus. . . . Do thou receive him as my own bowels,"—as my own heart, we might translate it.

Oh, beautiful and sublime! But when the Neros had spent their rage and run their course and been cast, an object of pity or abhorrence on the stairs of the Gemonial, outside the Mamertine, and when emperors and empire were Christian; and when the civilized world claimed the care of the successors of Peter; when within and beyond the boundaries of the empire a new world had arisen, and was widening, widening ever, created by the zeal of the Pontificate, and its kingdoms with their rulers and peoples all claiming the care of him who sat in Rome on the Chair of Peter, by the Tomb of the Apostles on the Vatican,—surely the Pontiff on whom fell the burthen of this world-wide administration must be free to receive in his home on the Vatican all who came to him,—and all had a right to come,—and free to send to them, to go to the ends of the earth, men who represented his supreme authority, his fatherly care, the unbounded charity of Christ. Surely such an authority, unique in its kind on earth, because in very truth that of Christ, of God Himself, must be supremely free, *and free in Rome*, the divinely appointed seat of authority, unity, government in the Church.

And being supreme, universal, œcumenical in its character, its purpose, and institution, it must be SOVEREIGN, temporally as well as spiritually, in order to be free.

No living man, no power, no principality, should have the right to say to the Vicar of Christ: "Do this," or, "I forbid thee to do that," or "Sanction this law," or "Repeal that other law."

How long "under such hostile domination" as the present is

Leo XIII. or his successors to be allowed the use of the Vatican with its garden? How long are the archives of the whole Christian world, the records of Christendom in its relations with the See of Rome, to remain in the possession of the Sovereign Pontiffs? Napoleon I. took forcible possession of them, sent what he liked of them to Paris, and allowed his subordinates to pilfer and to destroy. The Italian triumvirate of 1848-'49 again had possession of them, and they took away and destroyed what it pleased them. We know how the garbled, mutilated, falsified acts relating to Galileo were thus carried away, and made up and published, to get up a case against the Papal tribunals and the Pontifical authority. Scholars know several other instances.

But the simple possibility of the guards of the Piedmontese King, or of the Radical Republic which is ready and waiting to gather his succession, entering the Vatican to-morrow, or next year, or in the near future, and possessing themselves of the last home of the common father of Christendom and humanity, of pillaging, ravaging, dispersing, or destroying the records of the Church our Mother, of profaning the manifold treasures which the hands and hearts of so many generations have accumulated there, only brings strikingly, vividly, home to us this great Catholic truth, that the Pope must be master in his own house, and, to be so, that he must be under the domination of no man, no people, no power; that he must be SOVEREIGN, temporally as well as spiritually.

But is he really not so? No! He does not descend to his own church of St. Peter's without running the risk of being insulted. He could not to-morrow go to officiate in his own cathedral church of St. John Lateran without creating such rioting in Rome as would cause disaster and bloodshed; as would imperil his own life, and that of his attendants and defenders. We in America, like all people far away from Rome, do not know the infernal spirit which the Revolution has evoked in Rome, and which walks its streets, and haunts its hovels, as well as its palaces, by night and by day, ready to rise at a signal and murder and profane!

So much about the *necessity* of the Pope's being really and truly, in every sense of the word, SOVEREIGN in Rome, Sovereign of Rome and of the temporal principality which the providential course of things, from the early ages onwards, created for the common parent of the Christian world, which the grateful consent of his own people and the international law of the entire civilized world guaranteed to him down to our own day; and which was wrested from him by means as iniquitous, by a treachery as foul, as any recorded in history.

Of course, the purpose of this paper is not to go into the titles of

the Papacy to the States taken from it in a time of peace by a power calling itself Catholic, and long and openly ambitious to be the sole master in Italy. The question simply is: Has the Piedmontese usurpation, and the consequent loss of all temporal power, been or not baneful to the Catholic religion in Italy? And, if baneful, how far has it been so?

Let us hear the present Pope himself on the subject. No man ever sat in the Chair of Peter more distinguished for moderation, wisdom, a thorough knowledge of men and of the times in which he lived, and that conciliatory temper which appeases rather than irritates. The golden opinions just won from all statesmen, diplomats, and publicists outside of Italy, by the prompt settlement of the Carolines or Pellew Islands difficulty, will give emphasis to our assertion. What, then, does the Pontiff, whom both hemispheres at this moment look up to with reverence, say upon the question to which we are seeking an answer?

In the Encyclical Letter *Etsi nos*, of February 15, 1882, addressed to the Italian hierarchy, Leo XIII. touches with his habitual tact and clearness the chief evils arising from the loss of his temporal sovereignty on the one side, and on the other the anti-Catholic, anti-Christian spirit of the government and legislation under which all Italy is suffering.

"We are compelled," he says, "to bestow peculiar thought and care on Italy. This thought and this care are inspired by something higher than mere human interests, by something far more divine. We are troubled and anxious about the salvation of immortal souls. Our solicitude and zeal for them are all the more intense and pressing that we see them exposed to the greatest dangers. And if ever at any time in Italy these dangers were truly formidable, they are especially so at the present moment, when the nature itself of the political institutions seems fraught with calamity to the very existence of religion. We are moved by the deepest concern in this matter, seeing what close ties bind us to Italy, in which God has placed the home of His Vicar, the seat of the great teaching authority in His Church, the Centre of Catholic unity. . . .

"A pernicious secret association, whose founders and leaders are no longer at pains to conceal or cloak their designs, has long been established in the Peninsula. They have declared themselves to be the enemies of Christ, and labor, therefore, to take away from the people all the institutions of Christianity. What success they have had so far we need not tell, since the havoc caused in the popular faith and morality is a thing obvious to all.

"Throughout all the populations of Italy, who have never wavered in their fidelity to the religion of their forefathers, the liberty of the Church has been annihilated; and more strenuous

efforts are daily made to blot out from all public institutions the Christian character, which has been at all times the honor of the Italian nation. The Religious Orders, with their houses, are suppressed, the property of the Church is sequestered, marriage is celebrated without any of the Catholic rites, and the youth of the country are brought up without religious instruction or control.

“To the bitter and deplorable war waged against the Holy See there is no term nor truce: this is to the Church a source of incredible trouble, to the Sovereign Pontiff a cause of supreme embarrassment. Despoiled of his civil sovereignty, he had to fall beneath the sway of a foreign power.”

Surely, the case is plainly put. Many of us in America accept, on the present condition of the Papacy and the prospects of religion in Italy, only the account given by the revolutionary press of Italy, or by the English press, and certain American correspondents wholly in sympathy with the Piedmontese spoilers. But, if we know that our poor neighbor has been by some trick of the law, or by the influence of some wealthy and powerful enemy, stripped of house and land, we cannot be satisfied with what the unjust owner will tell us of the condition and prospects of the former proprietor and his family; we must listen to his statement and believe it in preference to that of the wrong-doer.

Now hear what Leo XIII. says in that same Encyclical Letter about the condition of Rome—the home and city of the Popes—since it fell under the nefarious influences of the “secret association,” in whose hands the Savoy dynasty are only convenient puppets for carrying on the process of decatholicizing, dechristianizing Rome and Italy.

“The City of Rome, the most august of all Christian cities, is open to the entry and assaults of all manner of enemies. She is profaned by novel rites, and beholds in her midst heretical schools and temples. Worse than this, this very year—they tell us—the delegates and leaders of the Secret Association, which is the sworn enemy of Catholicity, are to hold here a congress or solemn council. The reasons why they should have chosen to assemble here are plain enough: their hatred toward the Church can thereby be expressed more insultingly, for they will defy the Papacy in its very seat, and wave under our eyes the ensigns and emblems of their victory.”

But the American public ought to know one fact among so many which appear incredible when first related;—in Rome, the acknowledged head of the Catholic religion until now, the civil authorities have absolutely forbidden the teaching of the Catechism in the primary schools, even in those taught by religious and supported by the government, and that when every child present there

is the child of Catholic parents! And in the upper schools not only is all religious instruction severely excluded, but every care is taken to secure teachers and professors whose opinions are openly and bitterly hostile to Catholicity.

In the meeting held in the Roman College on Septuagesima Sunday, mentioned at the beginning of this article, an incident occurred which throws great light on the kind of education given in the university schools here. That the Roman College should have been selected to celebrate an intellectual feast in honor of Giordano Bruno,—a celebration, by the way, boasted of by some of the organs of the sect, as one exclusively gotten up by the "Association,"—was evidence clear enough of the anti-Catholic character of the transformed institution at present, and of the training given therein to Roman and Italian youth. But, at the close of the lecture, a student of the name of Basso, in the name of an executive committee of his fellows, proposed that a monument should be erected in the Campo dei Fiori in honor of the apostate monk, Giordano Bruno, on the very spot where he was executed in punishment of his repeated acts of sedition and rebellion, and that a solemn assembly or congress should be held that day twelvemonth for the inauguration of this monument. As was to be expected, this double proposition was frantically applauded and accepted, not the least conspicuous in their enthusiasm being the *moltissime signore* present, they, too, being adepts or members of the "Association," ardent apostles of all the new doctrines and passions which are poisoning the national life in its well-springs.

And, be it remarked, while hatred of Catholicity, of the Papacy, of religious orders and the priesthood, is thus implanted in the minds and hearts of childhood and youth; while the Catholic Catechism is banished from every school in Rome, the Ministers of King Umberto, with Duke Torlonia and his town-councillors, bestow on the Waldenses, and on every non-Catholic sect attracted to Rome by hatred of the Papacy and the Church, not only the fullest liberty to teach their own Catechisms, to misrepresent and traduce before their young hearers the doctrines and practices of the Catholic religion, and to vilify the persons of its ministers, but the most positive encouragement to collect in their day-schools and Sunday-schools, by bribes in raiment and money, the children of the Catholic poor!

To be sure, Leo XIII. and his indefatigable, saintly, and eloquent Vicar-general, Cardinal Parocchi, are opening schools of every grade to counteract all these anti-Christian agencies. But they have against them all the influence, the resources, the authority of an unscrupulous government, aided by the most powerful organization for evil ever known in the history of the world.

And so the arch-enemy's work is carried successfully on in Rome!

Are the American, English and Scotch missionaries, who are spending so much money and wasting so much labor in "converting" Rome, never moved by any scruple of conscience with regard to their allies and auxiliaries? We are not questioning their convictions, or the sincerity of their zeal. But the preconceived hatred of the Pope and the Catholic Church should not blind them to the fact that the government which protects them, and the secret societies which work with them, have in view, not the triumph of the Bible, but the utter destruction of Christianity.

Hear again what the Holy Father says on this point :

"It seems incredible that such should be the design of men calling themselves Italians, and Italians devoted to the glory of their native land. For, if you take away from Italy the Catholic religion, you extinguish the chief source of her greatness. Much as she may have been, and was, to all other countries an unfailing benefactress, teaching their people the respect for law and the sacred immutability of justice, if her gentle power everywhere tamed the wild and headlong passions of men, if she associated herself with the citizens in the pursuit and enjoyment of everything that is honorable and great and glorious, if she bound together in perfect and lasting concord the orders in each State, and all the members of the commonwealth ; all this she did for Italy, but in a more effective manner and with a more lavish devotion."

The Pope continues in this strain to describe the special benefits conferred by the Papacy and the Church on the land it saved from the deluge of ills, brought on by the barbarian invasions, and then defended and protected from Saracen and Turk. He describes the institutions from which, through the Church, spring the order, well-being, prosperity, and greatness of states ; and then shows, by one or two graphic and powerful sketches, the social consequences of setting aside the authority, the teaching, the principles and practice of "Christian wisdom," as he so often terms Christian civilization in his magnificent encyclicals. The French Revolution and the short reign of the Paris Commune are instances illustrating what he is endeavoring to inculcate. And then he proceeds :

"If Italy has not, as yet, been a prey to a like reign of terror, we owe it, first, to a singular favor of God, and next we may assign as the reason that in Italy the immense majority having remained true to the Catholic faith, the criminal passions described above could not get the upper hand. If, however, the barriers which religion opposes to the inroads of evil be broken down, the torrent of ills which flooded and wasted other great and prosperous countries must sweep everything before it here also. Like doctrines

must lead to like results ; and, as the evil seeds sown are the same, so must they bear the same crop of evil fruits. Italy may even be still more terribly scourged, because to unbelief and impiety she would add the sin of enormous ingratitude.

“ May God avert such fearful issue ! Still let all consider well the dangers already realized, or threatening in the near future, who, unmindful of the general welfare, seek only the success of their secret organizations, and display such fierce hostility toward the Church. Were they guided by wisdom, or by true love of country, they assuredly would not excite hatred toward the Church, nor abridge and destroy her liberty, nor allow themselves to be blindly led away by anti-Christian prejudice. Instead of attacking Catholicity, they would defend and befriend it; above all, they would see to it that the Pope should enjoy his rights.”

In another letter to the bishops of Italy, Leo XIII. again and again denounces the laws enacted by the Italian Parliament on matrimony, as well as the entire system of State education. As to the latter,—since we have already touched upon it, we may as well state at once, what everybody knows who is at all acquainted with the state of things in the Italian Peninsula, that not only is all religious instruction excluded from the public schools of every grade, from the University down to the State infant asylum, but they declare it to be their purpose to make these schools so many instruments for undoing all that Catholicity had effected in the past. The notorious Doctor Baccelli, when appointed Minister of Public Instruction, began at once openly, boldly, to carry out the scheme imposed on him and the government by their common masters of the “ Secret Association,”—to make all instruction and education in the kingdom GODLESS. And he succeeded to his heart's content.

Of course you can calculate how long it will take, in any given country, to extinguish the last embers of religious faith, by the thorough and scientific working of a general net-work of schools of every degree, equipped with anti-Christian teachers and anti-Christian manuals of every kind, with a public press powerfully helping on the work of the teachers by daily lessons holding up to contempt, to hatred and to ridicule, all that past generations respected, revered, and worshiped ; and the same press flooding meanwhile the whole country with books of every size, with pamphlets, with publications suited to every purse and to every taste, exquisitely illustrated, so that even those who cannot read the text may not lose the lesson conveyed in the print ; and every one of these productions saturated with the deadliest soul-poison from the first page to the last, and every lesson conveyed in printed text, or by the finished skill of the engraver, teaching, in some one form or

other, contempt or hatred for the religion we Americans hold dearer than wealth, or honors, or life itself; all that subtly distilled and scientifically prepared poison killing in minds and hearts all reverence, all love for Him whom we have, for nineteen hundred years, held to be the God of our souls!

Is this a horrible dream, or is it a reality? But if a reality,—and, alas, it is,—to what a future it must lead!

But the education given in Rome and Italy by the Revolution, in the name of the House of Savoy, does not stop here. It is not enough to seize upon all the schools of a nation, and to organize and equip them, with the despotic and over-mastering energy of a power which recognizes neither a God in Heaven nor any moral authority upon earth; and to make this great educational organism work for one single, definite purpose, that of obliterating from the mind all religious notions,—should there happen to be any there,—and from the heart and life of childhood and youth all practical religious morality. The laws of Italy go further, the devices of the “Association” aim at something more: they take, by the conscription laws, the young man from his family and put him into the army or the navy for years. We are not speaking now of the terrible hardship and the no less awful expense entailed upon the people by this practice. It is only one of the crushing burthens imposed on the nation by the new order of things.

But neither in the army nor in the navy of the Italian Kingdom will these young sons of Catholic parents find any provision for their religious instruction and comfort, and facility for practising the duties of their faith. Living and dying, they are treated like the brute beast which perishes, which has no judgment to expect after death, no heaven to hope for, no hell to fear. Both army and navy are under the control of men high in the confidence of the “Association”—the dread, mysterious power behind the Ministers, the Parliament, and the Throne; the officers of every rank, as a general rule, are forced in self defence, if they would have any chance of promotion, to give in their adhesion; and no influence is spared to brevet as many of the men as possible. The whole atmosphere in which both professions live, is loaded with the poison of irreligious indifference, at best—with contempt and hatred for religion and its ministers, most frequently. How can these poor rustics, taken from the plough, from the religious simplicity of their homes, with their ignorance of the great, wicked world of city and army and navy, live several years in such an atmosphere, exposed to all the seductions of evil example, all the corrupting teachings of the new world into which they are brought, without religious control, or support, or direction,—how can they

return to their homes as they left them, the docile children of the Catholic faith?

Thus, the army and navy are two great schools, which carry on the work begun in the village school, if this—as is most often the case—is anti-Catholic, which begins and completes a counter-education, if that of the village school had been religious.

Add to all these perfectly organized systems of anti-Catholic education, the great army of officials in the various branches of the civil service. These are all, without a single exception, in the gift of the Ministers, and all bestowed, very naturally, on those only who support the government, and pledge themselves to promote the principles and the aims of the new masters of Italy.

In this education, given to the nation during more than a quarter of a century, the one great immediate purpose was to destroy the temporal power, as a first step toward the destruction of the Papacy. The Papacy still subsists in Italy and in Rome, with its uncertain seat in the Vatican. The Depretis government has shown, in more than one instance, that the Law of Guarantees, which professes to secure to the Pope the rank, rights, and revenues of a sovereign in Rome, cannot guarantee his dignity, as it did not that of his predecessor, against the power of the anti-clerical mob in Rome. We need only recall what happened when the remains of Pius IX., in 1881, were taken by night through the city to St. Lawrence's outside of the walls.

Most touching and eloquent was the remonstrance of the Holy Father in the Allocution delivered at the next Consistory. The savage inhumanity of the mob and the connivance of the government proved that the pretended sovereignty with its "guarantees" was a hollow sham.

As these pages are written a fierce parliamentary battle has begun in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, on the ruinous state of the Italian finances, with a deficit of over \$50,000,000, increasing yearly, while all productions are taxed to the utmost extremity, while the load of the farmer is intolerable, and the life of the laboring poor is not worth living. The fact is, that the great, powerful Radical party, the party of the near future, are clamoring for the downfall of the Depretis Ministry. Depretis and his associates, wonderful to say, are too conservative, too slow for these radical republicans, who are yearning only to realize the dream of Mazzini and Garibaldi,—an Italian republic without king or religion, without Church, or Pope, or priest.

The dream must become a reality before the present generation has passed away. And then what becomes of the Pope and the Vatican, and of all that remains of the great Catholic institutions? Providence is already paving the way for a return to better things.

Even should a sudden explosion of the anti-clerical hatred upset the dynasty throning in the Quirinal, and compel the flight from Rome of the Pope and the Cardinals,—it would be only a temporary calamity. Public opinion is growing in favor of the international character of the Papacy and its Civil Principality, and the day is not far distant when America as well as the Old World will interfere to secure Rome and the Vicar of Christ against such catastrophes as those which happened in the past and the one that threatens at this very moment. So the very extremity of evil will call for, and cause, an efficacious remedy.

But there are other evils which have fallen on Italian Catholics besides those we have been describing.

The bishops are in every way hampered in the fulfilment of the most essential duties of their episcopal office; and the priests are interfered with even within the church, even within the sanctuary, and at the very altar.

The prelates appointed to the vacant episcopal sees in Italy are refused the royal *exequatur*, that is, the official acknowledgment of their office, permission to take possession of the episcopal residence, and drawing their salary, or the miserable pittance at present allowed them by the government, after the seizure and confiscation of all church property and revenues. The Piedmontese government, as is notorious, set aside and violated in the most outrageous manner, without observing any of the usual forms of cancelling a treaty, every one of the solemn concordats and treaties entered into with the Holy See. It set itself in violent hostility toward the Holy See, after 1848, and passed law after law usurping the rights of the Church, trampling under foot her most sacred ordinances, and doing what none but the most bitter anti-Catholic could be supposed capable of doing. When Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, in October, 1870, crowning thus every former measure of sacrilege and usurpation, he at once assumed that the right of nomination to all the episcopal sees of Italy belonged to him, as if he were the heir to a long-established kingdom of Italy, between which and the Holy See there existed a concordat granting and securing the privilege of nomination. But no such concordat ever is established except between two friendly powers, and no such privilege of nomination is granted except to a friendly Catholic power. But Victor Emmanuel had repealed the Concordat existing between his own kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia and the Holy See; or, rather, he had torn it to pieces as so much waste paper. There had been no kingdom of Italy to which he could lay claim as rightful heir. The independent states of the Peninsula, like those of the Pope himself, had been usurped by the right of the mightiest and with the aid of the Revolution. He

could not set up the pretence that he inherited the rights guaranteed to the expelled sovereigns by any concordat. He could, above all, advance no such claim with regard to the States of the Church, whose sovereign had been the Pope himself. And yet he, the enemy and despoiler of the Pope and the Papacy, the enslaver of the Church wherever his arms prevailed, pretended that no bishop should take possession of his see without taking the oath of allegiance to the usurping sovereign of the Quirinal! We omit the other and consequent acts of oppression and vexation employed down to the present day against the Italian bishops, and which render their ministry in many respects a matter of the greatest difficulty. On the slightest pretext their salaries are withdrawn and their episcopal acts annulled, in so far at least as all outward effect is concerned.

The law obliging clerical students in the seminaries, priests of every rank, and even the rectors of parishes, to serve in the army, has, we need not inform the readers of the *REVIEW*, been rigidly enforced, and will be more so in the future. In more than one instance, the priest was seized on the altar by the agents of the public authority, stripped of his vestments, carried off to the barracks, and compelled to assume the military uniform. Is this to the advantage of Catholicity?

All this is well calculated to do away with reverence for the priestly office and character in the eyes of the people; to do away with any distinctive education and training for the priestly office itself; and to diminish by degrees and extinguish altogether the number of vocations to the priesthood. Thus, then, by usurping through the mere right given by resistless power, both the schools for educating the laity of every class, and to a very great extent the control of ecclesiastical education, the government has in its hands the two great founts from which flow Catholic life in Italy. We have just seen how they are planning to degrade the clerical and priestly character by the enforcement of the conscription laws, and by proceeding, step by step, to do away with any distinctive schools for training clerical students.

So, if no political revulsion intervenes to arrest their progress in this direction, vocations for the priesthood will go on decreasing in number with each successive year till they cease altogether. This lamentable decrease is already a subject of alarm and complaint to the French hierarchy; in Italy, both the Holy Father and the bishops have again and again solemnly proclaimed the existence and the magnitude of this new danger to the Church.

There is, in connection with this, another great source of Catholic life in Italy, another great nursery of apostolic zeal and priestly learning, which the government has doomed to utter and speedy

extinction: the religious orders of men and women, and, in Rome especially, the great parent establishments around the Chair of Peter, which fed and reared scholars, saints, and missionaries, ever ready to the hand of the Sovereign Pontiff for work of any kind on every point of the globe.

Superficial travellers,—Catholics even,—who visited Rome before 1870, complained of the extraordinary number of churches, convents, monasteries; of the multitudes of priests, and monks, and clerical students of every garb and nationality, to be seen everywhere. They forgot that Rome was, is, or ought ever to be, the great seat of Catholic learning, the great nursery of spiritual life, of missionary and apostolic zeal; that the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, is bound to labor unweariedly and as efficiently as ever he can, to rear up here men who are fit to go at his bidding to the ends of the earth, to be model laborers in the priestly office, model bishops in the episcopal chair, the light of the world wherever their lot is cast. Rome is—and all Italy ought to be, more or less,—something like a great permanent military camp, where the soldiers of the Lord of Hosts are carefully trained, under the eye of His Vicar, to fight successfully His battles among every tribe, in every land. Charity and mercy, and the prayerful contemplation which ever pleads at His Throne for the needs of the busy, toiling, surging crowds of the outside world, have, and ought to have, by right their nurseries and training-schools around the abode of Christ's Vicar. These are the mother-houses of the religious orders of women. They, too, train and prepare recruits for that other great army which has its battalions all over both hemispheres ministering to the bodily and spiritual wants of suffering humanity, training the women who are to be the Christian mothers of the coming generations, or lifting up their hands in prayer for a sinful world.

Rome is like no other city. It is the home of all Christians, of all humanity; for it is the home of the common father, teacher, and guide, appointed by the Creator and Redeemer of the race, Christ Jesus.

This has been, as this ever ought to be, the glory and the boast of Italy, which makes her the spiritual head of the world, and the centre to which all nations come, and from which Christian civilization radiates to every shore.

And the great crime, the unaccountable blindness of the men who rule Italy to-day, consists not only in their ignoring the immense, the incomparable moral influence of the Papacy, and the unique position providentially created for the City of the Popes,—but in their laboring to close and dry up in the churches, monasteries, convents, and other Catholic institutions of Rome, the very

fountain-head of Catholic life, the ever-flowing springs of civilization irrigating the whole earth.

They know what they are about, however. But Catholics, who do not understand the immense, the irreparable injury done to their religion, done to the entire human race by the suppression and destruction throughout Italy and in Rome of the monastic orders and their nurseries, must be either very ignorant or very unsteady in their faith.

We have said that in a Catholic country, like Italy, and in the very centre itself of Catholicity, the interference and anti-Christian legislation of the Piedmontese government followed the priest in his very ministrations within the church and within the sanctuary. We have mentioned instances of parish priests seized at the altar during the celebration of mass, and taken perforce away to the barracks to serve in the ranks. But the new law-givers of Italy went further. They prohibited even in the country places the solemn procession of Corpus Christi prescribed by the ritual and practised, to the delight and edification of the people, ever since the establishment of the feast of the Blessed Sacrament in the thirteenth century. Within the year last past, in the city of Rome and within the great court of the chancery palace, belonging to the Pope, the city authorities forbade the procession of the Blessed Sacrament! What would it be if, as before 1870, the procession was held in the square of St. Peter's, the Pope himself officiating? Protestants have described the solemn scene under Pius IX. as the most magnificent ever beheld on earth. It was the triumph of our EMMANUEL in the central sacrament of His love; it was the holiest, dearest rite in Catholic eyes, after the Divine Sacrifice itself; and the Pope dares not celebrate it within the precincts of the basilica of the Holy Apostles and of the great square designed and constructed to favor the sacred function!

But there is more than this. It is the real anti-Christian legislation on the Sacrament of Matrimony and its administration, as prescribed by the Church and her councils. The matter of the sacraments by divine right falls within the jurisdiction of the Church alone. In Christian marriage the very contract, or mutual consent, by which the parties pledge themselves for life to each other, is the essential matter of the Sacrament. Under the law of the Gospel, it is the duty and the province of the Church to see to it that the parties fulfil all the conditions required by Christ and by the Church herself. She has to see that both the man and the woman come to the performance of this contract with all the dispositions and conditions that may secure them the fullness of blessing and grace attached to the worthy performance of the contract, the pledging of their mutual consent, which, given in presence of

her minister or according to the forms she lays down for its validity, becomes, *ipso facto*, a Sacrament of the New Law, having its august type in the union of Christ with His Church.

To be sure, the State has a deep and vital interest, for the sake of families and the valid inheritance of property, and other causes, in the due and faithful observance of all the forms and rites prescribed by the Church in matrimonial matters. Therefore it is, for instance, that in Canada, where the old French law still holds, the registers of marriages, baptisms, and burials, authenticated by the bishop, are kept in duplicate; one register being kept in the parish archives, and one in the Prothonotary's office in the Court of Queen's Bench. This natural and reasonable interest and superintendence of the State the Church admits, wherever both powers, as it ought to be, agree with each other and act in concert to secure the interests of religion which are those of the State as well, the well-being of families, the peaceful and rightful transmission of property.

Such was the accord between the two powers which existed in every state in Italy before the year 1848. As the Piedmontese armies invaded state after state, till Rome herself fell into their power, the old laws and forms relating to matrimony were set aside. The revolutionary power would not recognize the divine right of the Church, universally acknowledged in Christendom before the "Reformation," over the matter and form of the Christian matrimonial contract, or Sacrament of Matrimony. Every man and woman who intend to contract such a union are bound under the severest penalties to apply to the civil authorities, and to be married by them. They may go to the parish priest afterward if they like. But one can imagine how, by degrees, all sorts of moral obstacles are put in the way of their doing so. And thus it becomes more and more the custom, in Italy as in France, to be satisfied with the civil marriage, and to have nothing to do with the priest.

This is not all. But should the parties dare to go to the priest first, and should he have imperative and most urgent reasons for blessing their union then and there, both he and the contracting parties are open to the severest penalties of the law.

Hence—not to go further into this matter—the sacred union of marriage, the foundation of the Christian family and the Christian home, as the family is itself the foundation of the State, is violently, sacrilegiously deprived by the new Italian laws of its holy character and the consecration of religion.

So marriage, the sacred fountain of family life; so education, the very root of the Christian State; so all that is most fundamental and vital in domestic and civil society, is thus made godless in the

new order inaugurated in Catholic Italy and in the capital of the Christian world.

With what results the intelligent reader may easily imagine. Let one man, whose venerable years, whose glorious services to Italy, whose sufferings for her cause, transcendent literary fame, and inflexible devotion to the Church and her pontiffs, have made his name dear to all scholars and all Catholics,—let Cesare Cantu tell us how far Catholicity has gained or lost by the Revolution and the suppression of the Temporal Power.

In a letter written to the author of this article on October 13th, 1884, he says :

“The information you give me on your own country is very precious. Good and evil are mixed up together with you, as in other lands. With your present population and your vast territory, your last year’s budget (expenses of government) was only \$240,000,000, while ours in Italy was \$300,000,000, a sum that compels them to crush us down with imposts. Thereby industry and agriculture are cramped. Money with you, I think, is to be had for 3 or 2 per cent. Here we get 5 or 6 per cent. for it. This is the reason why foreigners, Englishmen especially, are so eager to risk their money in Italian speculations.

“I am only speaking of northern and central Italy; for in the south interest is demanded at the usurious rates of 12 and 20 per cent., and even then one has no security. The low state of public morality in our country is a something incredible. There seems to be left no feeling of honor, of delicacy, of honesty. A long, long time must elapse before Italy becomes worthy of her destiny. One great obstacle is the war which is waged, openly or covertly, not only against Catholicity as an institution, but against the principles of Christianity itself. The question of the Temporal Power, unhappily, affords some reason for treating as the enemy of Italy a religion to which is due her chief greatness. The different Protestant sects are going to great expense to found establishments; they spend for that some eight or nine millions of francs annually. ‘This,’ says in concluding a report drawn up by one of their ministers, ‘is a great pecuniary resource for Italy.’ The government affords them all possible facility for their labors. It is in their favor that catechetical instruction has been banished from our elementary schools, as well as all religious acts connected therewith. For the crucifix and the portrait of the Pope they have substituted those of Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel. Baccelli, our Minister of Public Instruction, who shows himself all the more ardently hostile to Catholicity that he was formerly a subject and servant of the Pope, lately appointed a commission to choose school-books for the kingdom. One of the conditions imposed by these gentle-

men is, that no books shall be admitted which treat of any form of religion. Fortunately, people pay no heed to this rule. In Milan the Fröbelian establishments, the primary schools, and the infant schools begin with prayer, and teach the children their morning and evening prayers, church hymns, and catechism. So the little ones, even if prevented from going to mass, return to their homes after contracting the Christian habits which our rulers are fain to do away with.¹

“Just now again I am sent statistical tables which show, among other things, that from 1863 to 1883 suicides were reckoned by thousands. Our prisons are crowded with condemned criminals. Immorality is daily on the increase, and crimes are multiplying on every hand.”

God knows how sincerely we desired that Italy, in pursuing and attaining the object of her aspirations after national unity, could have preferred federation to centralization! But Piedmontese ambition has ruined all.

¹ The Milanese Catholics have a good deal of the old Lombard spirit about them; it is sadly lacking in other cities of Italy.

LECTURES AND CATHOLIC LECTURE BUREAUS.

THE work of lecturing would seem to be assuming of late somewhat ample proportions. If to the degree of amplitude corresponds the degree of efficacy in spreading Catholic influence and thought, we think that the movement augurs well in the line of Catholic progress. Lectures are understood to be learned discourses. They may be written, but they are also to be spoken. They are not essays, which are only to be read. Nor are they quite what is meant by speeches. For speeches do not include that element of erudition which the title of lecture seems to guarantee. Perhaps it is owing to this element of learning in his address, that the lecturer not only by custom commits to paper the results of his researches, but is privileged by fashion to have his manuscript with him and before him.

The supreme value of spoken instructions, and of the spoken word generally, is a topic that has often been insisted upon; and we do not think that we could add anything, and enforce the logic of the position, either in theory or in practice. The nervous vitality of the spoken word may assuredly be left to defend itself even to the end of time. Yet there are not wanting artificial systems of theoretic or practical education, of religious or ethical instruction, which screen from view this evident principle, that man was meant to be instructed orally, by word of mouth; and that the written word on the printed page is at best a reminder, a memorandum, of subordinate use in the work of development. This is true in every order of development, literary, scientific, moral, and religious. Yet, in certain systems of education the text-book is allowed to grow like a fungus over the oral system of teaching in the primary and the grammar school. In certain denominations the written essay, read from the desk, has supplanted the whole function of the living word. And we know how, in the whole non-Catholic world which claims to be Christian, the dead printed page of God's Word in Holy Writ is made to bear the burden of all religious teaching and dogmatic affirmation, to the complete ignoring and extinction of oral tradition and of the Church's voice. And the consequences are such as we see, a gradual extinction of all religious affirmation, and a complete ignorance of Christian life.

In view of these and other considerations, we may be allowed to emphasize a little the privileges of the spoken word in our days and in our parts of the world. And this may be the more readily granted us, as we mean to make a passing allusion to an enterprise

upon which, here and there, Catholics are now embarking, and which we have named at the head of this article.

If there ever could be a real controversy between the spoken word and the written word, the question, such as it was, stood at a certain degree of controversial fervor several centuries before Christ. The state of the question then was, not merely about any extra degree of pleasantness in the spoken more than in the written word. This might evidently be admitted, that there was more pleasantness, more variety, more facility of understanding. The question was much more trenchant than that, when Socrates was arguing upon the subject with his friend Phædrus. It was simply whether the word when written was intelligible at all, unless it was first spoken, and heard as spoken, and understood as explained by him who spoke it; whether the written word was practically intelligible at all, unless the spoken word was beforehand in preoccupying the learner's mind; and, more than that, whether subsequently it continued to retain any value except as explained continually and interpreted by the traditional word, which "like a father," said the sage, has to defend the written page and to help it, since "it can neither defend nor help itself."

The whole passage of arms between Socrates and Phædrus is entertaining, and may be recounted here. The sage is telling his young friend a story. He says, the Egyptian god Thoth was the inventor of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, drafts and dice, and also of letters. With these inventions in his hand, the god approaches the king of Egypt, Thamous, and recommends him to make them known to the Egyptians. Thamous, however, is cautious; he does not take things unconditionally. He criticizes favorably or otherwise; and at last he comes to the letters of the alphabet. Ah! these, O King! says the god who invented them, will make your subjects wiser, and will improve their memory. Most ingenious Thoth! answers King Thamous, it is your fatherly affection for your own offspring that makes you talk of these letters so. Indeed they will neither improve the memory of my subjects, nor make their intellects wiser. Whoever uses your letters will rely on them instead of practising his memory. At best they are good only as reminders. Then, as to wisdom, your letters will make folks think themselves wise, without being at all so. They will think they know a great deal, while they have no judgment of their own to make their knowledge worth anything.

To this Phædrus replies: You are a great hand, Socrates, at telling stories from Egypt or any other country.

My dear Phædrus, answers the sage, do you know that, in times gone by, they made oracular responses come out of an oak? Men of olden time were not as wise as you young men. They

would listen to an oak or a rock, if only they could get the truth out of it. But you young gentlemen don't look for the truth. What you want to know is, who says it, and where was he born, and where does the story come from, not—is it true?

Phædrus submits to the rebuke. Socrates continues: The written word has one unfortunate characteristic about it, common to itself and to painting. Take a picture. It is life-like. But ask it a question; it is dumb. So is it with writing. You think that it speaks to you with some meaning. But ask now what that meaning is. Lo! there it stands with just the same word in its mouth. When once a thing is written it may be tossed over by all who read it, and it cannot say another word to explain itself, nor can it stop saying what it says. It knows neither how to speak nor how to be silent with the proper persons. And if you maltreat it or slander it, why, it must have its father come and help it, for it cannot defend or help itself. What is its father, what is its lawful brother, that knows how to defend itself and to defend the written word, that knows how to speak and to be silent with the proper persons? That is the spoken word engraving itself on the disciple's soul, with true knowledge; the spoken and animated word, whereof the written one is but a shadow.

My dear Phædrus, it is an earnest work in a high sense, when one, using the art of the living word, takes hold of fitting souls; and plants therein living words of true knowledge able to help themselves and their planter, words not fruitless, but having seed. And from that seed springs up a posterity of truthful minds, fit for immortality.

The plea for the spoken word, thus put forward by the great old philosopher of common sense, cannot fall under suspicion as having been specially conceived to condemn either private judgment in religion or the modern text-book in schools. Yet it condemns both, and many other things besides. The one point which it makes salient at all times and at all ages of life is communication by word of mouth. Not only "faith comes by hearing," but everything in the way of enlightenment must own a certain degree of indebtedness in the same direction. However, we must be more definite here.

Oral teaching, to use the term in any strict sense, is imparted either in the school-room or in the lecture hall. In the school-room it is not called lecturing; nor is any form of oral teaching, which is at all appropriate there, to be confused with the notion of what is properly a lecture. This is very evident if we speak of primary education. But in secondary education likewise, or what we mean by liberal studies, it is only slowly that the lecture begins to find a place. According as the mind of the student begins to

be independent, and to show the results of careful and stimulating development, according as the trained mind begins to possess some material of its own, and some initiative too, wherewith it can work on a hint given or kindle at a suggestion, does the function of lecturing first appear inceptively and tentatively upon the scene of his studies. And this is the point at which the student may now consider himself introduced to the studies of a university.

We do not intend to speak of the university lecture, although it is the only one strictly so called and in the full sense. It may be delivered from the pulpit; and then it is the sacred lecture. We mean to speak of the popular form, which no doubt was originally an outgrowth of the university. It was an indulgence in higher studies, brought out of the lecture hall, and brought down from the professor's chair, to elevate the busy thoughts and to refresh the thirsty souls of men deeply occupied outside. Whoever first made the lecture popular, and brought it out into the living, active world, may be credited with having accomplished the same work as Socrates in other days. He, says Cicero, called down philosophy from heaven to earth, and brought it into cities and houses, and made it modify life and shape manners, and try the good and evil of things. He assigned it a province of its own, very wide and very important. That was to move about amid the thoughts and actions of the daily practical man, and do there what religion should have done, if there had been a religion then to do it. But as there was then no religion worthy of the name, the work which had to be done with men's minds and hearts was attempted by the philosopher's lecture, or, rather, in the case of Socrates, by the philosopher's talk and catechism. This was the express profession subsequently of the philosophers down to Seneca and Epictetus; and it is an instructive fact. For to-day a large portion of the cultured world pretends to acknowledge no religion. Now, if the lecturer do not undertake in some part that work of religion, with the appliances and aids of positive truth and latent sentiment, which the old philosophers knew nothing of, the work of religion must remain unattempted and the pathway to faith remain for many a man practically unknown.

Though we are going to speak of the popular form of lecturing, yet before we leave the university and the professor's chair, there are several interesting lessons to be learnt from positive facts connected with that subject. One regards the habits of mind in an audience; the other regards the financial working of popular schemes.

As to the habits of mind in any body of hearers, it may be observed that for regular university purposes two conditions seem requisite. One is, that the hearers show the results of prior train-

ing, and be in possession of prior material, up to that point which the lecture to be delivered presupposes. The other condition is, that they command a degree of independent initiative and of mental vigor decided enough to work upon suggestions given, and to follow out a line designated. Now, with the popular lecturer addressing a mixed audience the state of things is not the same as with the university lecturer. In our mixed populations, and in the audiences which our Catholic popular lecturers are likely to gather before them, it rarely happens that they may take for granted the prior training and liberal education which the university lecturer has a right to presuppose. As to the independent initiative and mental vigor, which is the second condition to be noticed in an audience, there are some useful reflections which arise here. In the populations which we see around us, and which we notice to be so appreciative of educational results, we cannot fail to observe that many a young man, as well as many an elderly person, flocks to lectures not merely popular, but also of a university grade, in the fond hope of supplying at a leap what they feel to be a great deficiency in themselves, through the want of liberal studies. Their good will in the effort is seldom adequate for success. Difficulties beset their path; and they are difficulties both negative and positive. The deficiencies in the line of prior development are negative; as is also the want of previous material duly gathered and set in order. But there are, besides, positive obstructions to be encountered, in the preoccupation of the mind with crude, cross, mixed-up notions, which have been picked up everywhere, and which now obscure the vision, and make the rays of truth struggle into the mind as through a jungle or a thicket. Thus many a willing mind is hopelessly slow in feeling the cogency of a truth; it is at a loss what to do with new mental contributions; it knows not how to arrange them and where to locate them, so as to make them fit in gracefully with all the rest of its knowledge.

We are speaking of real lecturing, and of significant instruction. It is quite possible that one may profess to lecture and succeed only in entertaining. If the effort does not convey what is worthy of a permanent place in the mind either developed or maturing, it can be styled a lecture only by courtesy. It is properly an entertainment of a literary or artistic kind, and it may possibly convey what a carriage drive or a summer tour might teach. But that is only refreshing and entertaining; it is not lecturing.

There is another lesson which may be gathered from the professor's chair. It is on a very practical point, without which nothing can live. Finances are of vital importance in the endeavor to do good, and any facts or items of information which may throw light upon this subject are undoubtedly of prime consequence to

Catholics in their endeavors to promote true culture. It may be that plain facts here will sober down undue exhilaration of spirits; but they need not therefore extinguish noble ambition.

There is now going on in Great Britain an enterprise called the University Extension movement. It is under auspices that are most favorable and most fashionable. Powerful interest and enlightened taste combine to further the undertaking, and the utmost economy is observed to make the good of higher education extend as widely, because as cheaply, as possible. Just one difficulty meets the execution of the programme, and that is the finances. The facts are these: A body of authorized teachers, taken from the most highly-trained and successful graduates of the University, are formed to travel about the country and answer the demands made upon them for series of lectures, to be delivered in sets of not less than twelve lectures each. A number of such series, regularly attended, and finished with appropriate and strict examinations, will eventually raise an auditor to a valuable university degree. Those who can apply for such series of lectures, to be thus brought right down to their homes, are not only philosophical societies and institutes, free and subscription libraries, but also any special society or company formed for the purpose. Now, when these are happily managed and the audiences made large, it is found that the total charge for one of the courses need not exceed three shillings for the whole set of twelve lectures. Yet the financial difficulty is described as being the greatest thus far met with. It affects the lecturers, though they have the rich university at their back; and it affects the hearers, though these have not to leave their homes, but can receive the university advantages right at their doors. It is a curious development in the cause of culture. It is said that the lectures are assiduously frequented by all classes of society alike, and yet the seekers after knowledge do not seem to value knowledge at its cost price.

These are remarks which we are quoting from a scientific reviewer on the movement. We might add a reflection of our own. It would appear as if the divine law of giving, and receiving not, were the only one by which higher education could ever be imparted. Here we see that in a country like Great Britain, where traditions preponderate towards the esteem and use of higher studies, a popular and liberal project, with professorial ability thrown in without stint, must struggle in order to live, and that, too, when the pittance needed to live well is but a nominal fee. Nor is it a Catholic body that has the matter in hand. The suspicion arises in our mind that perhaps the professors of higher education have a latent vocation to become a new order of Knights of Science, vowed to poverty, if the spirit of science would only

make that fashionable, outside of the Catholic Church, and make them willing to subsist on the fortieth part of a university professor's salary, throwing in their health and their life as a martyr's contribution to the cause. We trust, indeed, that higher education and university development will, in the United States at least, move to a lighter step, and march on with a more cheerful air. But the observation made here by the reviewer whom we quoted before is quite apposite. Without being a Catholic, he implicitly pays that tribute which all history must concur in paying to the Catholic spirit and to Catholic times. He observes that the great work can never be furthered except by the same principles which founded the great monuments of educational zeal abiding to our day. "Higher education always did require the help of the patron of letters and of the founder of the college."

Nor is it only in letters, but in the most favored pursuits of science does the same financial obstruction bar the way. We have heard a plea made and reiterated, under the taking title of the "Endowment of Research." It was taken up and re-echoed far and wide. "The waste of water-power at Niagara," was the querulous strain indulged in, "is as nothing compared with the waste of brain-power, which results from compelling a man of exceptional qualifications to earn his own living. The owner of a great estate admits that the important charities of his town have a well-founded claim on his purse. It would not require a very great change of heart for him to feel a vivid sense of shame if a few scholars are not carrying on their researches at his expense." This appeal, instructive on its own account, had come reverberating from divers magazines on both sides of the ocean, when an Oxford professor had occasion the other day to deliver an address in his capacity as president of a newly-chartered institute of chemistry. He thought fit to animadvert upon the terms of this appeal. He called it "cant." He thought scientists might manage to live by their science, no matter how. His contention was that men of science had a right to live; let them use their science as a means of livelihood and live by it anyhow. To this a solemn editorial in a leading scientific journal gravely responded, protesting. It propounded its views on the whole duty of a chemist, and took the professor solemnly to task for his profane and low views.

Common spectators like ourselves may have a right to infer that, even on the privileged ground of science, finances are an element of disturbance; and, if so, how much more troublesome may they not be in the work of Catholic lectures. To these we now return; and we say that if the popular Catholic lecture would only go of itself, and the right kind of people would only come of themselves, and the expenses of the hall and other matters would only adjust

themselves automatically, while enlightenment could shine over all meanwhile, there would be no need of much financial management, nor of an organized arrangement to consolidate the business basis of the scheme. But, as things are, the one thing indispensable next to the finances themselves, is some good management to set them in order and to keep them so.

There is no doubt but that much activity has lately been exhibited in the interest of Catholic lecturing. A suggestion was made some months ago, and it was credited to a distinguished writer in this *QUARTERLY*, that public conferences should be given by able Catholics on points of Christian doctrine; that the men who expounded such points should be able, by their ability and eloquence, to command the attendance of the curious and interested; and that the places chosen for the conferences should be those which could easily be reached by the mass of the infidel and the indifferent. Various laudable efforts have recently been made here and there. In Chicago a series of popular lectures have been given, apparently with such satisfaction that we have caught the echo of commendation returning from the other side of the Atlantic. In Baltimore we have seen a similar programme followed, and so far encouraging in its results as to suggest a flattering inference which has, in fact, been drawn with regard to the prospects of a new university. Elsewhere similar efforts assume proportions to arrest general attention, and the excellent results upon mixed audiences seem positive indications of a great field opening. On this account, so much the more importance attaches to forming a right estimate of the whole enterprise.

In none of these instances which we have cited was the effort made separate from a Catholic institution, and flung out, as it were, into the midst of the general population. Yet this is a salient point to command a certain portion of the field. There is a large body of the population which labors under the weight of sheer prejudice with regard to our institutions; and though the presentation of philosophical subjects, of ethical and scientific questions, may well be considered to leave the collegiate hall free from the imputation of what the narrow mind calls "sectarianism," yet there is no arguing with a certain order of prejudice, there is no making it liberal, and a large class of the infidel and the indifferent will no more enter a Catholic institution than they will gather round a Catholic pulpit. Protestantism is not what it was. Indeed, there is little left of any Protestantism which can claim to have been before. That spirit of sectarianism which started in the sanctuary has now had time to find its way to the theatre. It has no pulpit, nor does it care to see one; no altar, nor will it hear from one; no

temple, nor will it find itself inside of one. There is "the appointed desolation"—barren infidelity.

This movement, which we call Protestantism, began in a disturbance, not unprovoked, of moral, social, and national life. It maintained, at first, a set of doctrines which the necessities of the moment postulated. The moment flitted, the necessities changed, and the doctrines grew. Able men and busy generations were not wanting to make them grow; and the law by which they did grow made them disintegrate into new systems, decompose into ulterior elements, and finally crumble into the dust which to-day strews all natural science with the thinnest residue of the supernatural. The law of dissolution which has brought it down to this is simply that of men's minds being active and every man having a mind of his own. When once the process of error and corruption has begun, nothing can withstand such a solvent as the action of men's minds upon the tenets and doctrines which are submitted to their criticism. This solvent is technically rationalism. It is a destroyer which has grown on the vitals of Protestantism; and the system of independent and wilful thought, which began at the pulpit and listened to the answers returned to it from the pulpit, is to-day abroad in the wide, wide world, as a wandering rationalism that knows neither guide nor compass, has neither faith nor hope, and is without God in the world. Now, it seems very useless to look for this fugitive spirit except by pursuing it, and on this view we could conceive a party of laymen organizing to have skepticism sought out and confronted, wherever it is likely to be found.

The Catholic Lecture Bureau of St. Louis started out upon such a principle. It formed itself of twelve laymen, who were moving about in the various walks of social and business life, and who by their position and influence could command attention and help to direct public opinion. They took special pains to select a subject which should be of live interest to every man of the times, and should enjoy a fair chance of engaging the widest attention by being treated in a public hall. The subject chosen was "Culture and its Relation to the Modern Mind;" which relation naturally divided itself into the four aspects of religion, arts, science and social life. The gentlemen tendered an invitation to different lecturers, soliciting the favor of hearing them treat the whole subject in due order before an audience indiscriminate as to its religion, but as select as could be in point of culture. The result of their negotiation was that the Right Rev. Bishop Keane, of Richmond, spoke of the religious sentiment under the title of the "Light of the World;" Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, of Merriam Park, Minn., treated the social aspect under the name of "Man's Aims in Society;" Right Rev. Bishop Spalding discussed the side of the liberal arts under

the head of "Self-Education;" and the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J., treated the side of "Scientific Culture." The audience in actual attendance comprised the best representation of the non-Catholic community. And it is confidently affirmed that financially, as well as intellectually, it has been the most successful course of lectures given in St. Louis, whether under Catholic or non-Catholic auspices.

Be that as it may, we are not of the opinion that any personal attractiveness or intellectual excellence of individual men will ever succeed in making of a lecture programme a financial success. If the one before us has been successful, it is owing, we imagine, to the constitution of a bureau. Here it is just the same as with mercantile enterprise. The best work offered will not bring customers, unless the work is brought home to the customers. They expect to be waited upon. Style and lecturing are become such a common commodity, not without proving to be counterfeit sometimes, that the public are to be excused if they show themselves not over-hasty in running to a lecture hall. We know of a case in a single great city where, in a short space of time, one popular preacher of great name, a New England divine, and another speaker of not less notoriety, failed utterly to gather an audience, the one a single time, the other twice. We must understand, then, that clever management, proper advertising, personal activity on the part of laymen who are themselves moving in the different walks of social life and are prominent,—all these are functions of what we conceive as a business bureau. Their time and personal concurrence in the work are perhaps of more value than the financial risks which they are willing to stand. And certainly no greater title to respect could add dignity and weight to their invitation, when they solicit the best talent in the country to lecture under their auspices, than that they themselves should be known to be acting on pure Catholic principle, to be risking money, sacrificing time, and devoting all surplus proceeds to the poor, merely for the sake of rendering possible a work of highest zeal, of genuine devotion, and of true Christian charity.

We should anticipate some specific difficulties in an enterprise like this. It has often seemed to us that Catholics might be excused from many things, not only because their numbers are limited, but also because what they have in the way of means, and what they themselves are in personal ability, are both largely preoccupied in work and business of their own. And when there is question of new efforts in the way of charity or zeal, though true charity is boundless, and zeal is a fire that never burns too brightly, still we say that the general excuse has often seemed plausible. The men are preoccupied; their available funds are preëngaged in

charities already urgent. Money, therefore, and what is often more precious than money, the personal work and personal activity, and the time necessary for this, are oftentimes not forthcoming. Whatever the case may have been with regard to the efforts of this bureau, we observe that no lay speaker was engaged to expound any part of their first year's programme. The fact suggests a useful reflection; whether perhaps, even if capable men are really preoccupied by business, such work as this may not be rightly classed by them under the head of business. If endowing a charity with permanent funds is generous, why should it not be generous, nay, from a Catholic point of view, imperative, to endow the public mind with the funds of one's mental treasures? It seems the noblest business that can claim a place; and, if a place, then its own degree of precedence.

And to finish our sketch of the work with an observation upon the subjects treated, we would not have it understood that only the negative work of meeting rationalistic ills, and curing the diseases of the mind, is the full function to be discharged in this lay mission of lecturing. It is true that one part of the function is medicinal and corrective; but the better part is primarily corroborative and constructive. All that is positive in Christianity, and all which in Christendom is due to the progress of the Church, is a principal part of the lecturer's work before the world. If Protestantism has retrograded and disintegrated, the spirit of Christianity, and all that is due to the influence of the Church, has gone forward on its way with the advance of years. If Protestantism is not where it was, neither are we, but in quite an opposite sense. Whether the "Reformation" had come or not to leaven the mass of Christendom with the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, the Church would still have continued leavening it with her spirit as of old. That spirit of hers is truth in every order; not merely in matters of faith and morals, but in matters of art also, of science, of industry, of social progress. The institutions which she had founded early have all developed, from constitutional governments down to primary schools. The literatures which she had set a-growing, and for which she had stood as godmother in fostering the national life of peoples, were all in process of unfolding when Protestantism came, and they were still to be beautified in their respective tongues. The art of printing, which had been invented, was already at work in making all the treasures of enlightenment a common property of men. The fine arts owned the Church as their sole custodian and patroness. Science was to march forward, keeping the line on which her priests and scientific men had set it moving. Protestantism came. Did that change the rights of ownership and the prerogatives of patronage and taste? It did

change much, as we know. But in spite of the disasters which it occasioned, it could not stop the progress of the spirit with which the Church was leavening and has since leavened nations. And Protestantism even fell into line and coöperated. But it has always been with this remarkable difference: that the most beautiful thoughts of the most infidel mind are always Christian, sprung from the inspiration of the Church; while whatever is distinctly non-Catholic is distinctly neither beautiful nor moral.

All this, then, is ours. The beautiful and the moral, the intellectual and the true, all are ours in the right of our Catholicity. This is the positive side of our work, to exhibit all this to the world; and it is a work not restricted to the pulpit, but is common to it and to the professor's chair, and to the mission of lecturing on the secular platform. We cannot afford to leave our patrimony for strangers to appropriate. Nor can we give things which are holy to those who own them not. And, indeed, aliens claim these things, and arrogate them in such a vein that you would think all science was born with them, and the arts would have died but for them, and that letters are their handmaid, and all civilization only their precious heirloom to posterity. No, *sancta sanctis*, holy things to the holy, and truthful things to the true.

THE TRADITIONAL MISREPRESENTATION OF
IRELAND.

THE chances that a National Parliament will be again called to meet in Dublin after nearly a century's efforts to force the unnatural Union with England on the Irish people, are now among the highly probable events of politics. After a lengthened period of refusal to even hear the Irish demand for self-government, and a few months of noisy protest against the idea of granting it, the English public appears to have settled down to regarding Irish Home Rule as inevitable, and though its national prejudices will no doubt flare out again and again during the discussion of the question, there will be no strong popular movement against its concession outside Parliament. The House of Lords will doubtless oppose the measure stubbornly, but in the present state of the British Constitution the Lords must and always do yield to a strong majority in the Commons. The question to be solved is, will the House of Commons decide in favor of granting Home Rule to Ireland? If it does, Home Rule will be an established fact in no very long time. If not, the Parliamentary struggle must be renewed between the English and the Irish representatives at Westminster, until the former are forced to yield.

Much of the hope of a speedy close of the struggle undoubtedly rests on the friendly disposition of Mr. Gladstone towards Irish Home Rule. His control over his own party in the House of Commons is almost absolute, and the great majority will follow wherever he leads. He carried the Disestablishment of the Irish State Church, with but little aid from the nominal representatives of Ireland, through Parliament, though it was a measure not less repugnant than Home Rule is to the blind prejudice which forms so marked a character of English public opinion. The regulation of the relations between landlord and tenant, independently of the will of the landlords, was equally unpalatable to the commercial instincts of the dominant trading classes in England who would hold, like Shylock, to the necessity of enforcing a bond at any cost. Both Disestablishment and the Land Bill were distinctively Gladstone's own measures. His colleagues at the time, as a rule, felt less interest in their success than even do their successors to-day in the granting of Home Rule, and yet both measures have been carried into law by the force of Mr. Gladstone's will. That the veteran statesman has, to a certain extent, sympathies with the

rights of nations even against English rule, is also true. He withdrew the English protectorate over the Ionian Islands more than twenty years ago in deference mainly to the demand of the people for union with Greece. He renounced, after a short struggle, the control over the Transvaal, which had been lawlessly seized by his predecessor. Small instances of generosity as those may seem to weigh against the bombardment of Alexandria, the invasion of the Soudan, and the seizure of Burmah, we believe they are unique in modern English history. The lawless annexations and invasions are a part of the common public policy of the Empire ; the giving up of plunder freely is exclusively the act of Mr. Gladstone. All this is undoubtedly encouraging to the hopes which the majority of the Irish race now feel of the speedy restoration of their national government.

It will not do, however, to believe the victory already won because Mr. Gladstone is well-disposed, and the Irish members a formidable power in Parliament. The paths of politics, and especially those of English foreign politics, are dark. It is little over four years since Gladstone himself consigned Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, Sexton and O'Kelly to solitary imprisonment, on no charge but that of differing in opinion with himself on the value of his reform measures in Ireland. Mr. Forster commenced his career as Irish Secretary with the strongest professions of sympathy with the wrongs of the Irish people, and of his own determination to redress them. In four months time his system of redress reduced itself to the summary imprisonment of every Irishman who presumed to criticise his government. No voice was louder in its denunciation of the iniquity of English rule in Ireland than John Bright's twenty years ago, yet few English statesmen to-day are more bitterly opposed to the abolition of that rule, when its destruction is a question of practical politics and no longer one of mere declamation. Mr. Chamberlain's professions of the broadest liberality towards Ireland, three or four years ago, have not kept him from raising his voice fiercely against any project for allowing her people to govern themselves. With these examples before our eyes, it is only common sense for Irishmen to put little trust in the consistency or sense of justice of any English statesman, unless those qualities be stimulated by a sense of enlightened self-interest.

In speaking thus we are far from seeking to discourage the well-grounded hopes of the Irish people for a speedy recovery of their national government. Those hopes rest on a much stronger basis than the good-will of any English minister ; they rest on the growing strength and wisdom of the Irish race itself, and the necessities of the British Empire. But, looking back on history, we

cannot but remark how often the cause of the Irish people has been ruined for the time by an excessive trust in the honor of English ministers. Pitt's promise of Catholic Emancipation was an important factor in bringing about the ill-starred Union, and the deluded nation found too late that a temporary resignation of office was all that the all-powerful minister needed to relieve himself of his inconvenient pledge. The reluctant acknowledgment of Irish parliamentary independence, in 1782, was received with a shortsighted enthusiasm which allowed the quiet suppression of the volunteer force, which alone had extorted that measure from the fears of the government, but which was thoughtlessly attributed to its generosity. The pledged word of William of Orange, a century earlier, had induced the soldiers of Sarsfield to lay down their arms in the full confidence that their religious and personal liberties were secured ; but that word was broken without a moment's hesitation, as soon as the French fleet had sailed from Limerick. The older Confederation of Kilkenny might have easily achieved national independence half a century before, if the majority of its leaders had not allowed their policy to be moulded by a blind trust in the promises of Ormond, rather than the rules of practical statesmanship. An unwarranted trust in the promises of the unworthy son of Mary Queen of Scots had brought about the cessation of Hugh O'Neill's struggle for Irish liberty, at the beginning of the same century, and paved the way for the Plantation of Ulster and the Penal Laws. "Put not your trust in princes," is a lesson written on every page of Irish history, and one which should never be forgotten by the Irish people.

To comprehend the reason of the excessive trust in the pledges of foreign statesmen, which has been so often shown by the Irish people, we must take a somewhat wider view than is usually done of the relations between England and Ireland. The struggle between the Irish and English races, the one seeking liberty and the other domination, and neither fully succeeding in its object, is on the whole unexampled in its duration in history. The strife between the Spanish Christians and the Moslem Saracens for the possession of the Peninsula is the nearest parallel to it, but with this important difference, that the contending races in the British Empire seem to have almost the same relative strength to-day as they had when the struggle began with Henry the Second. The ministers of Queen Victoria, in the nineteenth century, find it as hard a task to bring Ireland into full subjection to English rule as the Norman barons of the Plantagenets found it in the twelfth. Every century during the intervening time has seen the struggle go on with varying fortunes and under various forms, but with the one essential feature of Ireland against England. Normans and

Tudors, Cromwellians and Williamites have in turn established their various ascendancies only to pass away in a few generations, and to leave the population of Ireland still as distinct in blood and character from that of Britain as it was when Strongbow first set foot on Irish soil. The vitality of the Celtic race has not failed in the long contest, but its national organization has been shattered; and it is this circumstance which makes the struggle so peculiar a one. Race hostilities have, unhappily, been only too common in history, and have often lasted through long periods. The Hundred Years War between France and England, from Edward the Third to Henry the Sixth, the equally long contest between the House of Bourbon and that of Austria during the seventeenth century, and the antagonism between Russia and Poland, are examples of national quarrels lasting through many generations, but each of them is quite different from the struggle between the English and the Irish races. In the former cases it was government against another government as well as race against race. In Ireland it has been the struggle of a race without a national government against a hostile race fully organized. The forces of statecraft and diplomacy have been almost entirely on the side of England, and their very nature has scarcely been apprehended by the Irish people. That truth and honor have a different meaning in the mouths of rulers and politicians from that which they really bear amongst men, has never been realized fully in Ireland. Hence a readiness to accept specious promises from their adversaries, which in its turn has made such promises its favorite instrument with English statesmen in their dealings with Ireland. The attitude of the Irish people towards the English government has been not unlike that of a simple witness in the hands of a crafty and unscrupulous lawyer. The latter has a code of ethics of his own, distinct from the ordinary rules of intercourse between man and man, and he avails himself of it to the fullest to entrap his opponent. Pitted against an adversary like himself, he would not venture to expose himself to retorts in kind; but as he has no fears of such, he allows himself the fullest liberty to make truth appear falsehood and falsehood truth. Such has been to a great extent the conduct of English statesmen in the relations with Ireland. They recognize no obligations of right and wrong in general, even such as are universally accepted by civilized nations. The English Parliament would never dream of violating the Treaty of Ryswick or of Utrecht, but it felt no scruple about setting aside the equally solemn obligations of the Treaty of Limerick. The ministers of Elizabeth would hardly have ventured on employing assassins to take the life of Philip of Spain, and they would certainly have disowned such measures in public; but they felt no scruples about bargaining for the murder of Shane,

Diomas, or Hugh O'Neill. The latter were only Irish leaders, so any measures against them were consistent with English ideas of public honor.

This spirit runs all through the dealings of the British government, whether royal or parliamentary, with the Irish people. It has contributed not a little to mystifying the Irish cause in the eyes of nations outside the quarrel. It is hard for a Frenchman or a Spaniard to understand that when English public men of high standing speak of the prevalence of crime in Ireland, they do not mean that it is nearly as prevalent as in their own land, or that lawlessness in Ireland means a refusal of the people at large to submit to the lawlessness of officials and a self-styled ascendancy class. The question is much easier to understand when it is borne in mind that the Irish policy of the government is almost wholly moulded on the traditions handed down for centuries in the bureaux of Dublin Castle. Each generation of English politicians denounces the acts of its predecessors in Ireland, but each is equally ready to use the weapons of misrepresentation against the Irish people.

It should be remembered, when we are dealing with English misrepresentations of the Irish national struggle in our own day, that they only carry out the policy which has been consistently followed by the English government during the last three centuries. The efforts of Elizabeth to force the Irish people to the profession of a creed in which they disbelieved are at the present day denounced by every public man in England, but at the time they were unctuously boasted of as a reformation of religion and a restoration of God's worship. The hiring of poisoners to make away with Shane O'Neill while the Queen of England professed to treat him as an ally, was only a "subtlety" of statecraft in the eyes of the English rulers of the day, who plumed themselves on their English honor and English honesty as much as do their successors. The confiscation of Ulster and the expulsion of its inhabitants from their ancestral lands was, in the words of Sir John Davies and his colleagues, a planting of law and justice in a barbarous country. Strafford's seizure of the property of a peaceful province under pretext of legal flaws in the titles of its landholders was, in the words of that nobleman, nothing but a vindication of the sovereign's just claims to his own. The confiscation of the lands of the Irish Catholics by the Parliament which sent Charles the First to the block, was described as a just punishment of rebellion against authority. Cromwell's sweeping three-fourths of Ireland of its native population by beat of drum and under pain of death, was, in the English phraseology of the day, a godly purification of an idolatrous land, and not, as Mr. Chamberlain, or even Lord Salisbury, would now describe it, the extermination of a people for

the profit of England. Two short years after the death of the Protector, when the system of government and state religion which he had set up was overthrown, and described by Parliament as a wicked and traitorous rebellion, the Broghills, Orrerys and Cootes, who had been its chief agents in Ireland, were continued in the possession of the plunder they had acquired at the cost of Irish loyalists. The title given to this proceeding by the Court of Charles the Second was an Act of Settlement, and the robbery of the Irish population was legalized on the plea of not disturbing the rights of property. The invasion of Ireland by the Dutch usurper of the English throne was invariably spoken of by his adherents as a vindication of national liberty. The Irishmen who fought at the Boyne, and Athlone, and Aughrim, and Limerick for the defence of their land and its king and parliament, were constantly spoken of as rebels, and the infamous Penal Code was during nearly a century described as an almost perfect system of civil and religious freedom. The absurdity of such claims seems too great for belief, but they were constantly repeated with an appearance of good faith that might well impose on the world at large. Indeed, they even made some impression on a part of the Irish people themselves. Irish Catholics were found in '98 to publicly express their gratitude for the protection of the law, and to compare favorably the freedom which they enjoyed under the British Constitution with that of the natives of other lands under absolute rulers or rabid revolutionists. It seems impossible that men whose lives and liberties were at the absolute mercy of martial law and a bloodthirsty oligarchy, should imagine that they were really in the enjoyment of an enviable degree of freedom; yet such was actually to some extent the case in Ireland. It is little wonder that a large part of its people should have taken the political harangues of ministers for proofs of friendship, and confounded the shams of political intrigue with the honest management of public affairs.

The increasing knowledge of the Irish people has already had a good effect in lessening the misrepresentations of English statesmen; and as the former increases, the latter will no doubt decrease still further. Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, and Davitt are no longer "instigators of murder" and unconvicted traitors, in the language of English politicians; and the necessity of depriving the Irish people of their freedom to keep them from exterminating one another, is no longer insisted on since it has been found impossible to enforce coercion. The London press, however, and its American copyists still keep up the tradition with an energy worthy of a better cause, and not without some effect outside England as well as within it. For Irishmen, the best weapon against such attacks is

a clear comprehension of their nature. Their utterers have no belief in the charges they make, and indeed are generally quite indifferent as to their truth or falsehood. The only thing they seek is news; and if an invention will serve the place of a fact, it is furnished as readily, and often as readily accepted by the public.

As for the trust in individual English statesmen which has so often been shown by the Irish people, we sincerely hope its day has gone never to return. We believe that Mr. Gladstone is morally and intellectually far above the level of most of his colleagues and rivals in English politics, but we hardly think him capable of subordinating his political interests to his conscience to any heroic degree. We can count to a certain extent on generous impulses in his actions since his career has shown that he is capable of them. That he desires at present to crown his long career by a happy termination of the long struggle between England and Ireland, we can well believe; but this, too, is rather a sentiment than a principle. Generous impulses are very good things in a powerful ruler, but they are liable to be somewhat capricious, and we do not care to build very lofty castles on such foundations. We shall doubtless hear much during the next few months of English generosity in relation to Ireland, but on that feeling we are even less disposed to rely than on the impulses of Mr. Gladstone. The best guarantee that exists for Home Rule is that its refusal is a serious menace to the existence of the Empire, and that English statesmen are beginning at length to realize the fact. It may not be necessary to proclaim it ostentatiously, but such is the true reason why Home Rule has taken such a prominent place in British politics to-day.

GOD AND AGNOSTICISM.

THE recent controversy between Mr. Spencer and Mr. Harrison has had at least the good effect of defining more clearly than ever the position of Agnosticism and that of its sister infidelity, Positivism. Their attitude towards Christianity is more distinctly perceived, as well as those issues wherein each agrees and disagrees with the other. Mr. Harrison, as spokesman for Positivism, declares that it has accepted Mr. Spencer's doctrine of the inconceivability of the First Cause as enunciated in "First Principles." Reasoning logically from this premiss, furnished by Mr. Spencer himself, it has reached the conclusion that the function of religion cannot be to cherish, as an object of adoration and reverence, this Unknowable outside of human thought and consciousness. But, as religion is a necessity to human nature and to the regulation of human conduct, the proper object of such veneration is to be found in humanity itself. Mr. Spencer, on the other hand, scouts and ridicules the conceit of a creed and cultus founded either upon the abstract notion of humanity or on its collective concretion, and stoutly maintains that the only and proper object of religious worship is that infinite and eternal energy "from which all things proceed," and which, he warns us, is, at the same time, unknown and unknowable. The function of religion Mr. Spencer conceives to be the fostering of this mystery along with the perpetual inculcation of its insolubility.

Without attempting to pass judgment upon the antagonisms, which the late controversy has revealed between Mr. Spencer's Agnosticism and Mr. Harrison's Positivism, it will be interesting to go back to that premiss which both, in common, accept as indubitably true. Is Mr. Spencer's doctrine of the Unknowable upon the substantial footing that both claim? Has it that consistency with sound reason that both assert? The answer to these questions will bring us back to Mr. Spencer's "First Principles," wherein the doctrine of inconceivability is discussed fundamentally and at length. Accepted, as it has been, without dispute by a certain class of thinkers, it has established itself with many as a profound and irrefragable refutation of theological and metaphysical conceptions. Mr. Harrison says that Mr. Spencer, as much as any living man, has torn "the slip-slop of theologians finally to shreds;" and such is the current belief with those who either accept, without investigation, the authority of Mr. Spencer's dictum, or who,

finding the speculations of metaphysical science too labored and painful for their abilities or time, congratulate the weakness of their intelligence in the thought that theology and metaphysics are, after all, absurdities which Mr. Spencer's trenchant criticism has finally exposed. Metaphysicians and theologians, in consequence, have been rated as charlatans. It will, perhaps, be startling to Mr. Spencer's followers to call in question their master's first principles, and still more startling to learn that they do not rest upon as secure a basis as is imagined.

The second chapter of "First Principles" opens with an illustration of the incompetency of the human mind to conceive things as they are. This illustration treats of its failure to imagine the actual curvature of the whole circumference of the earth.

"We cannot conceive, in its real form and magnitude, even that small segment of our globe which extends a hundred miles on every side of us; much less the globe as a whole. The piece of rock on which we stand can be mentally represented with something like completeness; we find ourselves able to think of its top, its sides, and its under surface at the same time, or so nearly at the same time that they seem all present in consciousness together; and so we can form what we call a conception of a rock. But to do the like with the earth we find impossible. If even to imagine the antipodes as at that distant place in space which it actually occupies, is beyond our power, much more beyond our power must it be at the same time to imagine all other remote points on the earth's surface as in their actual places. Yet we habitually speak as though we had an idea of the earth—as though we could think of it in the same way we think of minor objects."

In this passage we first ascertain Mr. Spencer's notion of ideology. In proportion to the magnitude of the object, the greater grows the impossibility of conceiving it. Magnitude, then, is the gauge of our power of conception. The smaller an object is, the better we can represent it in thought, and the larger it is, the less chance it has of being conceived. We can, mentally, represent "the piece of rock on which we stand with something like completeness," because its likeness can be crowded more easily into the mind than if it were a thousand times as large. An elephant can be pretty well represented in thought, but if the animal were fifty times as huge, it would stand fifty times less opportunity of being mentally grasped. It is to be observed in the passage just quoted, that Mr. Spencer uses the words *imagine* and *conceive* in exactly the same sense. "We cannot *conceive* in its real form, etc.," and, "if even to *imagine* the antipodes, etc.," and, again, "the piece of rock on which we stand can be *mentally represented*, etc." Do *imagine*, *conceive*, and *mentally represent* express one and the same idea in Mr. Spencer's mind? Such, evidently, is the implication in this passage, and such must we infer it to be from the application of the principle he deduces from this illustration. It is here we must put in our demurrer. Mr. Spencer confuses two distinct

operations, imagining and conceiving, and would deduce from the impotency of one the defect of the other. Imagination is a faculty which concretely represents objects, and intellect is a faculty which abstractly represents them. Because the imagination fails to completely and adequately picture the total circumference of the earth's surface, it does not, therefore, follow that our abstract concept of the earth is unlike the reality. Mr. Spencer declares in the following paragraph that our conception of the earth is drawn from two ideas, that of "an indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and that of "a body like a terrestrial globe;" "and thus we form of the earth, not a conception properly so-called, but only a symbolic conception." As Mr. Spencer has not told us what is a "conception properly so-called," he leaves it to be inferred what a "symbolic conception" is. As nearly as we can ascertain from the passage we have quoted, a "conception properly so-called" is with Mr. Spencer simply the phantasm of the imagination, and a "symbolic conception" means an abstraction. Our idea of the earth is formed, he tells us, by coupling together the idea of "an indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and "a body like a terrestrial globe." What he really means is that, from the phantasms of this "indefinitely extended mass beneath our feet," and of this or that "body like a terrestrial globe," we abstract our idea of the earth. But it is not a legitimate deduction to conclude that our concept of the earth is merely symbolic and unrepresentative of the reality, because the phantasm of the imagination fails to picture in its totality the circumferential magnitude of the earth. By whatever methods, direct or indirect, we learn that the earth is a sphere, our conception of it, as a sphere, is a true and real representation, and not simply symbolic, which, according to Mr. Spencer, can only signify unrepresentative.

Mr. Spencer's next step in ideology is to show that a large proportion of our conceptions, "including all those of much generality," are of this symbolical order, or truly unrepresentative. "Great magnitudes, great durations, great numbers, are none of them actually conceived, but are all of them conceived more or less symbolically; and so, too, are all those classes of objects, of which we predicate some common fact." He proceeds to illustrate this by an example, beginning with a particular, and then, by process of abstraction, dropping out of thought, first one note and then another passes up the scale over a series of universals, each last more universal than the preceding. In proportion as he ascends the scale of universals, does the concept become less representative and more symbolic. His symbolic ideas are, therefore, nothing more than generalizations; and the more generic the idea, the more symbolic it becomes, and consequently less representa-

tive. All abstractions, according to this doctrine, are symbolic, and do not truly represent realities. It is only concrete phantasms which represent objects in their reality. When, then, I predicate the idea *man* of any individual, I am not attributing to him any reality; I am simply using a symbolic conception, to which there corresponds no reality in the individual. When I say, "this animal is a mammal," there is nothing in the animal itself corresponding to my predicate, which is simply symbolic. Such is Mr. Spencer's process throughout. Our symbolic conceptions, when they cannot be verified by "cumulative or indirect processes of thought," are "altogether vicious and illusive, and in no way distinguishable from pure fictions." But why they cease to be "pure fictions" when verified by "cumulative or indirect processes of thought," we are left vainly to imagine. Certainly no "cumulative or indirect process of thought" can ever make an abstraction a concretion, or a conception a phantasm; and, according to Mr. Spencer, it is only phantasms which are truly representative. Upon this system of ideology Mr. Spencer proceeds to build his doctrine of the Unknowable. If all he assumes be granted, he has, indeed, an easy task to convince the mind that accepts his premises.

The three systems of philosophy accounting for the origin of the universe, Mr. Spencer informs us, are, "that it is self-existent, or that it is self-created, or that it is created by an external agency." All three are alike unthinkable, Mr. Spencer asserts, and in their ultimate analysis evaporate into contradictions. Respecting the first of these Mr. Spencer argues that the idea of self-existence presents an inconceivability:

"In the first place, it is clear by self-existence we especially mean an existence independent of any other—not produced by any other—the assertion of self-existence is simply an indirect denial of creation. In thus excluding any idea of any antecedent cause we necessarily exclude the idea of a beginning; for to admit the idea of a beginning, to admit that there was a time when the existence had not commenced, is to admit that its commencement was determined by something, or was caused, which is a contradiction. Self-existence, therefore, necessarily means an existence without a beginning, and to form a conception of self-existence is to form a conception of existence without a beginning. Now, by no mental effort can we do this. To conceive existence through infinite past time implies the conception of infinite past time, which is an impossibility."

Mr. Spencer's reason for concluding the impossibility of thinking self-existence is, that this idea implies the notion of infinite past time. It is in this he is to be disputed. The idea of self-existence does not include that of infinite past time, but excludes it. Existence without a beginning necessarily means existence outside of time, for time necessarily begins, and self-existence, as Mr. Spencer himself admits, means existence without a beginning.

To conceive a self-existence which begins to be is impossible, no doubt; and when Mr. Spencer attempts to associate the ideas of self-existence and beginning, he naturally enough finds incompatible concepts. Time necessarily implies succession, but self-existence excludes the idea of succession, because it *implies* the idea of complete and perfect being, which is repugnant to successive being. Self-existence means the most perfect and complete existence which repudiates all mutations of time. Instead, then, of including the concept of infinite past time, which Mr. Spencer would saddle upon it in order to argue its inconceivability, our idea of self-existence transcends and negatives all notion of time. How, then, on this score it is mentally inconceivable, remains to be proved. It is easy enough to form a notion of an inconceivable by associating two incongruous ideas, and thereby develop a contradiction. I can associate the idea of *square* and *circle*, and get the inconceivable *square-circle*, which process is analogous to Mr. Spencer's method of arguing the inconceivability of self-existence. He would place the self-existent under the category of time, which implies beginning and succession, and then complacently conclude that self-existence is a contradiction, because it fails to agree with a notion intrinsically repugnant to it. This is making the man to fit the suit, and not the suit to fit the man. As long as Mr. Spencer argues that this universe cannot be self-existent, we must agree with him, and for the very reason which we have used against him, viz., that the mutable and successive are repugnant to the idea of self-existence. But when Mr. Spencer argues that the idea of self-existence is an intrinsic contradiction, because he would make it include the idea of infinite past time, which denotes succession and mutation, reason cannot agree with him; and if we refuse to call his argument sound, it arises from the fact that sound sense forces us to this view.

The hypothesis of self-creation does include the contradiction which Mr. Spencer argues. His exceptions to this theory we pass over, and agree with him in his conclusion. To what we mainly wish to turn our attention is his argument against the hypothesis, as he terms it, of an external cause as accounting for the universe. Passing by his argument in regard to the impossibility of conceiving the non-existence of space with the remark that this impossibility is but the figment of his own imagination, since he is really endeavoring to outstrip the phantasm of his own imagination by projecting one image beyond the other, as a foolish hound might endeavor to outstrip his own shadow, we will turn to the main consideration of the question. Of course he applies his supposed inconceivable self-existent to the external Cause of the universe, against which, he asserts, it equally holds. This we have seen to

be the result of a misconception on his part. Mr. Spencer admits, and, indeed, argues, back to a First Cause; but, like self-existence, he holds that this First Cause is inconceivable. It is in our endeavors to conceive the nature of this First Cause that we run against "intolerable contradictions." It is either finite or infinite; it cannot be finite, for that immediately throws us into the absurdity of supposing it to be dependent upon another, which is tantamount to saying it is not first. But

"to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the absence of all other existences, seeing that if the presence of any other existence is necessary, it must be partially dependent on that existence, and so cannot be the First Cause."

In this passage we observe, first, an assumption without warrant, to the effect that "to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the *absence* of all others." Why, in order to be independent, it is necessary that the First Cause should exist in the *absence* of all others, is not stated, unless it be upon the further assumption that the First Cause *necessarily* produces its effects. Then it remains to be proved that the First Cause necessarily creates, which Mr. Spencer not only fails to do, but which, upon his own hypothesis of the Unknowable, he could not possibly do. As long as the First Cause is conceived, as it must properly be conceived, to create voluntarily, it cannot be argued that the presence of its effects limits its independence. On the contrary, since its effects can be or can not be, that is, are contingent beings dependent upon the will of their Creator for existence, so much the more distinctly is its independence shown in the fact that its effects are totally dependent upon it for their being, and can be cancelled at the fiat of its will. Their contingency demonstrates indubitably the total independence of their cause. Whether they exist or not, it remains untouched in its existence, and its independence is more clearly seen in the light of their utter dependence upon it. Strange is that logic which argues that the First Cause is dependent upon its effect for its existence. We must, therefore, entirely deny Mr. Spencer's assumption, when he asserts that "to think of the First Cause as totally independent is to think of it as that which exists in the *absence* of all other existences." The presence of contingent beings does not in the slightest restrict the independence of their cause. Mr. Spencer's argument resolves itself briefly into this: If there be present to the First Cause any other existence external to itself, then is its independence restricted, and it, therefore, ceases to be first. But there are external existences whose presence is necessary; therefore the first independent is not independent. This is, of course, a con-

tradiction; *ergo*, the First Cause is inconceivable. The assumption is apparent that the presence of other existences is necessary, and limits the independence of the First Cause. It is, therefore, to be denied that the presence of other beings is necessary, and that their presence limits the First Cause; their presence is not necessary, for they are essentially contingent *unnecessary* existences, and altogether dependent upon the First Cause; nor does their presence shackle the independence of the First Cause, for the reason that they owe their being to it, and are entirely subject to its will, which may cancel their existence at any moment. In the face of the foregoing Mr. Spencer's inconceivable vanishes. As in his argument against the conceivability of self-existence, so in his argument against the First Cause, we find his fallacy to consist in an endeavor to consociate incompatible concepts, which he labels "inconceivables," and foists upon the unwary reader as true, metaphysical, and theological conceptions of the self-existent and first Cause. Between Mr. Spencer's perversion and the true metaphysical conception there is as wide a distinction as exists between being and its negation, as between a circle and the contradiction, a square-circle. To the reader whose intellect may not be acute or well versed in matters metaphysical, this substitution is not perceived, and naturally enough he casts the *odium theologicum* upon the science of natural theology for breeding such intellectual monstrosities and forcing them upon the consciences of men. There are not a few who believe, for they cannot be said to hold it upon "rational conviction, that Mr. Spencer, as much as any living man, has finally torn to shreds the slip-slop of theologians," and this credulity comes entirely from the ignorant adoption of Mr. Spencer's metaphysical nightmare.

Having endeavored to show that the presence of external existences throws our conception of a First Cause into an inconceivable, Mr. Spencer continues his discussion with an attempt to prove that any "internal relation" conceived in the First Cause shows a like contradiction. "Not only, however, must the First Cause be a form of being which has no necessary relation to any other form of being, but it can have no necessary relation within itself." What he seems to mean by *necessary relation within itself* we find in the next sentence: "There can be nothing in it which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change." The change which Mr. Spencer speaks of can only mean, in the light of the context, change within the First Cause itself. Here is his reason for this assertion: "For if it contains something which imposes such necessities or restraints, this something must be a cause higher than the First Cause, which is absurd." Respecting Mr. Spencer's position on this point, it is to be first said that a First Cause and self-existent being necessarily postulates immutability;

that is, it cannot be any other being, and furthermore *must* be; it could *not* be. It is, therefore, a *necessary* being; but that which determines its necessity to be is its own nature. Because it is an independent being, unproduced, self-existent, its existence is necessary. If the necessity of its existence, which is its very essence, be what Mr. Spencer terms a "necessary relation within itself," then is Mr. Spencer's assumption to be denied *in toto*. His language is altogether irrelevant and misleading, if by necessary relation he means the necessity of existence in the First Cause, for between the First Cause and its own essence there can only be complete and perfect identity.

The hiatus here in Mr. Spencer's argument is so wide that it is difficult to comprehend what he does mean. Necessary relation within itself cannot plainly mean the necessity of the First Cause's existence, and yet it is almost beyond effort to think that Mr. Spencer can mean anything else. In the light of this is the absurdity of Mr. Spencer's next sentence made evident: "There can be nothing in it which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change." Certainly there can be nothing in a self-existent First Cause which determines change within itself, for there is *everything* within it to prevent change; the very immutability of its own essence, its own self-necessity, renders change within it an impossibility. To predicate change, therefore, of the necessary immutable is a flagrant contradiction, but it is by no means a proper conception of the First Cause. It is for the very reason that there is nothing within the First Cause to determine change that there is everything within it to prevent change. When, therefore, Mr. Spencer would draw his preposterous conclusion, or rather when he makes the naked assumption that the idea of a First Cause *necessitates* the concomitant notion of changeable immutability, we repudiate his illegitimate method as an insult to our intelligence, unfair to the metaphysical standpoint, and a perversion of truth. In this instance, as in every other we have considered, Mr. Spencer begs the question. He assumes each time what he wishes to prove. He asserts that the conception of a self-existence and a First Cause is a contradiction, and then proceeds to prove his point by an analysis of his own misconception. Instead of giving the true metaphysical conception, he substitutes in its place his own perverted notion made up of conflicting concepts, and then declares that the inconceivability of a First Cause is made manifest. This is what Mr. Frederick Harrison calls tearing the "slip-slop of theologians to shreds."

As if to pile Pelion upon Ossa, Mr. Spencer next proceeds to quote Dean Mansel on the side of the inconceivable. This is as if to say: "Reader, here is the argument of a *theologian*, who recognizes the truth of what I have said, and agrees with me that his

God, after all, is unknowable." But Mr. Mansel has fallen into exactly the same error of which Mr. Spencer is guilty. Mr. Spencer's auxiliary is as blind as himself, and their mutual error by no means makes truth. It is far from a triumph for the former to drag in the mistakes of the latter in vindication of his own position, even though Mr. Mansel "writes in defence of the current theology." Mr. Mansel's method is as far from the truth, and as antagonistic to true theology, as Mr. Spencer's. Having mentioned that Mr. Mansel has given preliminary definitions of the First Cause, of the infinite, and the absolute, Mr. Spencer quotes him as follows: "But these three conceptions, the cause, the absolute, the infinite, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? A cause cannot, as such, be absolute: the absolute cannot, as such, be a cause. The cause, as such, exists only in its relation to its effect; the cause is a cause of the effect; the effect is the effect of the cause. On the other hand, the conception of the absolute implies a possible existence out of all relation. We attempt to escape from this apparent contradiction by introducing the idea of succession in time. The absolute exists first by itself, and afterwards becomes a cause. But here we are checked by a third conception, that of the infinite. How can the infinite become that which it was not from the first? If causation is a possible mode of existence, that which exists without causing is not infinite; that which becomes a cause has passed beyond its former limits." By way of apprehending the real bearing of Mr. Mansel's implied contradiction, we will substitute analogous and more familiar terms for cause, absolute, and infinite, and see if the substituted terms suffer the same contradiction " these three conceptions, the artist, the man, the rational being, all equally indispensable, do they not imply contradiction to each other, when viewed in conjunction, as attributes of one and the same being? An artist, as such, cannot be man; the man, as such, cannot be artist." No doubt this appears absurd, but it is not one whit more absurd than Mr. Mansel's comparison. In this last the terms are clearly understood, and the reader sees at a glance the nonsense of the comparison. A proper conception of the terms cause, absolute, and infinite, will make Mr. Mansel's paragraph equally absurd. It is because Mr. Mansel has put his own contradictory and arbitrary meaning into the terms that he finds them so absurdly incongruous, and for the same reason Mr. Spencer quotes him. Mr. Spencer has told us what he means by the absolute, viz., that which exists out of all necessary relation to external beings and without any necessary relation within itself ("First Principles," section 12, page 38); or (to concede as much as possible to him), the Absolute is that which exists

"in the absence of all other existences." If the Absolute be that which can only exist in the absence of all other existences, then it must be conceded that the Spencer-Mansel absolute can never be a cause, and we may at once admit that the two notions are incompatible. If it be necessary for the existence of the Absolute that no other being should exist, then we grant Mr. Mansel's inconceivable. But such an absolute is an absurdity, and to couple it with the idea of First Cause breeds contradiction. The proper term is not absolute in the sense which Mr. Mansel and Mr. Spencer have given it, but independent being. They have confused the two. Absolute in its proper sense means independent being, and Mr. Spencer in spite of himself has described it as such, for he concludes the paragraph wherein he has discussed the absolute freedom of the First Cause from external and internal relations in these words: "Or, to use the established word, it (First Cause) must be absolute." We have already seen that an independent being does not necessarily imply a being which *can only* exist in the absence of all others, and that an independent being must be conceived as one in which at the same time there exists "nothing—which determines change, and yet nothing which prevents change;" and we have also seen that such an incongruous conso-
 ciation of ideas is Mr. Spencer's arbitrary assumption of an inconceivable, and not the true metaphysical conception. His absolute, then, really means independent. What incompatibility exists, therefore, between an independent being and the First Cause? The fact that it causes does not restrict its independence, as we have already seen. On the contrary, the contingency and dependence of its effects upon the First Cause heightens and defines more clearly our notion of its independence, for they can or cannot exist at the fiat of its will. It is true that there exists a relation between the First Cause and its effects, but this relationship adds nothing to, and takes nothing from, the First Cause, since the relationship is founded in the *creatureship* of the created. It arises from the *dependence* of the effect upon its cause, without which that effect could never have sprung into being, and upon which the effect, as long as it exists, *absolutely depends* for the continuance of its being. The effect gives no new entity to the cause, but, on the contrary, the cause gives total entity to the effect. The only novelty is the existence of the effect. Its existence constitutes on its side the relation of *total dependence* upon its cause, from which it receives everything. The cause must precontain in some way, and supereminently if First Cause, its effect; if then the creation of the effect could add anything to its cause, we would have the following absurdity, viz., a cause receiving from its effect what that cause never had; but the effect can only be what it is, inasmuch as it receives from its cause what it has; how, then, can the effect give to its cause that

which it had not? Nothing, therefore, can be in reality added to the cause by the creation of its effect.

If we are to accept the absolute as that which must necessarily exist in the absence of all other beings, we fall into the absurdity, as Mr. Spencer implicitly does, of conceiving an absolute which is dependent and coerced by a mere possibility; "the First Cause," says Mr. Spencer (if it is to be conceived at all, he understands), "must be in every sense perfect, complete, total: including within itself all power, and transcending all law. Or, to use the established word, it must be absolute." *An absolute which can only exist provided no other beings exist*, is no absolute, since that would force it into dependency upon the *possibility* that no other beings exist. How, then, can it be "perfect, complete, total, and including within itself all power, and transcending all law?" It is in this misconception on the part of both Mr. Spencer and Mr. Mansel of the true Absolute that their fallacy is to be seen. Here, as elsewhere, the contradiction is engendered by consociating incompatible concepts which were never meant to agree. The Absolute is not to be conceived as that which necessarily exists out of all relation to external beings other than itself; but the Absolute is truly that which exists entirely independent of all other beings, which are its effects, and the creatures of its will. When, then, we conceive the Absolute, it is not to be thought of as a being, which can only exist on the contingency that others do not exist, but exists whether they do or not. No wonder we find wretched contradictions in an unknowable manufactured to order, and fashioned to fit preconceived inconceivables. It is not strange that Mr. Spencer finds the First Cause unknowable, when at the start he makes it inconceivable.

Mr. Mansel's next step is to prove the inconceivability of the First Cause for the reason that we must conceive it to be a conscious Being, and to conceive it as such, he argues, is a contradiction. "Consciousness is only conceivable as a relation. There must be a conscious subject, and an object of which he is conscious. The subject is a subject to the object; the object is an object to the subject; and neither can exist by itself as the Absolute." Without quoting further we understand that Mr. Mansel's argument lies in the distinction between subject and object. There must, then, exist this distinction in the self-conscious Absolute. Here, therefore, we have a distinction in the Absolute which proves fatal; either the subject is absolute, or the object. If either, then the other is not the Absolute. If both are absolute, then we have two absolutes, which is a contradiction. In the first place, there is an assumption that consciousness implies a distinction which is real, viz., that the thinking of self either creates another self or an objectivity which is not self. As Mr. Mansel puts it, "the

object of consciousness, whether a mode of the subject's existence or not, is either created in and by the act of consciousness, or has an existence independent of it." In the first place, Mr. Mansel would implicitly apply a mode to the Absolute which cannot be permitted to him. To speak of the Absolute as having or being a mode of itself, is of course a contradiction. Our conception of the Absolute must explicitly eliminate all modes. It is to be denied that the object of consciousness is either created in and by the act of consciousness, or has, therefore, an existence independent of it. This is a pure assumption on Mr. Mansel's part, and lacks proof. When I conceive myself, or am self-conscious, the act by no means makes another self, distinct from or existing beyond myself. On the contrary, in order that I may be self-conscious the *ego* must already exist, and so far from creating myself by being self-conscious, I could not be self-conscious unless the *ego* already be. When I conceive myself in thought, if that be Mr. Mansel's self-conscious, I but make a logical distinction, a distinction *in thought* and not *in reality*. Much more, then, is the identity complete when we think of the Absolute, between whom and his thought there is not even this logical distinction, for his thought is himself. When we think of the Absolute we must conceive him to be absolutely himself without even logical distinction within himself; and while self-consciousness in a finite being implies logical distinction, though not real distinction or *in re*, self-consciousness in the infinite necessarily excludes even logical distinction. Instead, then, of finding an antagonism in the consciousness of the Absolute, the contradiction, like all the Spencer-Mansel inconceivables, arises from an endeavor to conceive the Absolute under concepts which it necessarily and absolutely repudiates. Instead of attempting to conceive the Absolute as a being plus that which is in direct conflict with it, in order to gain a proper conception of it, he must conceive it as in every sense "perfect, complete, total," minus all that which limits its omnipotence and its all-perfectness; in short, we must conceive it as infinite. But if we attempt to think of it as infinite and finite, which is the Spencer-Mansel method, we naturally strike on a contradiction. And this arises from the fact that we are not conceiving it properly, but striding our conception of the First Cause with notions repugnant to it.

Mr. Spencer's whole difficulty flows from a double misconception; firstly, he confuses the proper conception of the infinite with an element in what is called the process of removal, whereby the finite arrives at its conception of the First Cause. The human intellect reaches the First Cause by reasoning back from effects to cause, and then, on the principle that the cause must in some way precontain its effect, it conceives that cause to possess, not formally, be it noted, whatsoever perfections are perceived in the effect.

The effect is finite; therefore with limited perfection; the First Cause is infinite, therefore without limitation, and hence all perfect. The perfection of the Infinite must then be conceived as transcending all limits. But since the First Cause must contain all perfection to infinity, it stands to reason that it cannot contain the perfection of the finite formally, that is as the finite does. Our conception of the perfection of the First Cause contains three elements; first, that the First Cause possesses whatsoever perfection the finite does; secondly, that its perfection is beyond all limits, or infinite; and thirdly, that we can only conceive that perfection *analogically*, that is, we conceive the First Cause as possessing all those perfections which its effects do, yet not in the degree or kind in which they do, but transcending their imperfection infinitely. We may aid ourselves by an illustration, which of course falls short of the reality. An artist preconceives his statue and fashions it after the idea he has formed in his mind. While the statue possesses a perfection which the artist gives it, still it is not the same in kind or degree as the perfection in the artist's mind; the artistic prototype is in the intellectual order, and its expression in the material, and the one excels the other in perfection as the ideal excels the physical. As from the statue, which is effect, we can argue back to the artist's conception, so from effects we can argue back to the First Cause and glean some notion of its perfection. In none of these three elements is there the contradiction which Mr. Spencer advocates. That the First Cause possesses whatsoever perfection its effects do, in this there can certainly be no repugnance; that the First Cause possesses them to infinity must be true, for it could not be the First Cause if it did not. And just here comes in Mr. Spencer's misconception. He, as well as Mr. Mansel, mistakes the negative conception of the First Cause, *not* holding the perfections of the finite as the finite does under limitations, with the positive conception of the infinite possessing these perfections transcendently. The act of the mind here is to first deny limitations to the infinite, that is, negative the negation, which restricts the finite, and so take away the imperfection which makes the finite to be what it is. It then conceives the infinite as possessing all these perfections, which are the positive element in the human mind's thought, and moreover so transcendently that these perfections must be conceived through analogy with finite effects. This, the proper conception of the First Cause, is free from all contradiction. Mr. Spencer only argues a contradiction when he confuses the negative with the positive concept, and so asserts that we conceive the infinite under the limitations of the finite.

Mr. Spencer's second misconception takes its source from the confusion of the inconceivable with the incomprehensible. The inconceivable, as he uses the term, means that which is contrary to reason;

but the incomprehensible should mean that which is above reason. Now the First Cause is undoubtedly incomprehensible in its own essence, and beyond the conception of the finite mind. No created intellect can adequately comprehend the infinite. But this is a very different thing from not *apprehending* it at all. It is certainly within the grasp of the finite intellect to conceive the infinite inadequately, but because it does not grasp the infinite fully, it does not follow that its conception is a contradiction. When Mr. Spencer cites Sir William Hamilton as enumerating various "thinkers of note," who have held and advocated this doctrine of the inconceivable, both make the fatal blunder of supposing these thinkers to mean inconceivable in its strict sense, whereas they really meant incomprehensible, that which is *above* human reason, not contrary to it. Mr. Spencer cannot adequately comprehend the tiniest mote that floats in a sunbeam, yet what comprehension he has of it is not contradictory because, forsooth, he does not grasp it in its totality.

After his elaborate attempt to convince the reader that the First Cause implies contradiction in its conception, that it is "rigorously inconceivable," and that any hypothesis respecting the ultimate cause is "even unthinkable," what is our surprise to find Mr. Spencer endeavoring to demolish his own painfully constructed argument in the latter half of his chapter on "The Relativity of All Knowledge." After having approvingly quoted Mr. Mansel and Sir William Hamilton in favor of his doctrine, he turns and repudiates their reasoning, telling us "that there remains to be stated a qualification, which saves us from that skepticism otherwise necessitated!" Plainly, then, Mr. Spencer admits that his doctrine of the inconceivable leads to a skepticism, the burden of which he is not willing to take on his own shoulders. Skepticism, he sees, ends in absurdity, and so would involve him in a self-stultification. But he must escape from this "intolerable contradiction," and so he substitutes "a qualification" which serves him as does a plank a drowning man. Mr. Mansel's and Sir William Hamilton's "propositions are imperfect statements of the truth, omitting, or rather excluding, as they do, an all-important fact." What, now, is this all-important fact which makes the foregoing argument "an elaborate suicide," as Mr. Spencer characterizes it, and, at the same time, saves him from the absurdity of skepticism? Let us listen to Mr. Spencer himself: "Besides that *definite* consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an indefinite consciousness which cannot be formulated." What this indefinite is we will let Mr. Spencer himself say. "The error" (namely, of philosophers, like Sir William Hamilton, who are bent on demonstrating the limits and conditions of consciousness) "consists in assuming that consciousness contains *nothing but* limits

and conditions, to the entire neglect of that which is limited and conditioned; the abstraction of these conditions and limits is, by this hypothesis, the abstraction of them *only*; consequently, there must be a residuary in consciousness of something which filled up the outlines; and this indefinite something constitutes our consciousness of the non-relative or absolute. Impossible though it is to give this consciousness any quantitative or qualitative expression whatever, it is not the less certain that it remains with us a positive and indestructible element of thought." Mr. Spencer has been arguing with Sir William Hamilton that "to think is to condition;" hence, to think of the Absolute is to condition it, and thence arises the contradiction of a conditioned unconditioned. Mr. Spencer now asserts that there remains, in spite of this, a consciousness that there is some indestructible and positive element in thought, which rescues the mind from complete skepticism, notwithstanding the contradiction which the "*laws of thought*" force upon us. This positive element is an "indefinite something" which "constitutes our consciousness of the Absolute," and it suffers "no qualitative or quantitative expression whatever." Again he says: "The continual negation of each particular form and limit simply results in the more or less complete abstraction of all forms and limits, and so ends in an *indefinite consciousness* of the *unformed* and the *unlimited*." And this is the Absolute which is to save Mr. Spencer from the shipwreck of skepticism! A formless, vague abstraction, an indefinite consciousness of *something*!

Mr. Spencer's Absolute is nothing more than the indeterminate idea of being, which he reaches in ascending the categories by successive abstractions from the particular until he gyrates upwards into the dizzy transcendental being, that "indestructible" element, that "positive" something, which remains in spite of all laws of thought! Truly, this is a wonderful generation, an evolution worthy of Mr. Spencer's acumen, more miraculous than spontaneous generation, from the indeterminate, indefinite, vague, formless concept of being in general to create an Absolute "in every sense perfect, complete, total; including within itself all power, and transcending all law!" This, then, is that "ultimate reality" behind all phenomena, that "infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed!" This is the mysterious reality which we are to regard as the cause of all things, and of which Mr. Spencer can only think with reverence and humility, if he thinks at all.

This is the transcendent infinite, for the mentioning of which as a conscious being, who cares for and loves the creatures of his own making, Mr. Spencer so bitterly castigates theologians. It seems singular that Mr. Spencer should fall into such an animated and vigorous speech over his unknowable, when, according to

his own teaching, it is like nothing in the waters under the earth, nor anything in the heavens above the earth, nor aught that is on the earth; of which all predication fails; which is neither conscious nor unconscious, being nor non-being, loving nor unloving, good nor bad; for all epithets alike are meaningless when applied to it. If, then, we should even call it a liar and a deceiver, where would be the impiety? If we should say that it is supremely evil, where the wrong, since our words have no meaning? If it has given us intellects to know the truth, and then forever withholds the truth from us, what wrong in cursing it for the deception it duly practices upon us, holding us but as its playthings and in implacable cruelty torturing us with an omnipresent riddle which we must ever seek to solve, and ever fail? Did Fijian or Indian ever torture his victim with more fiendish malice than this barbarous unknowable? This is the mystery, to keep which alive in man's grateful mind is the sole function of religion. This the object of adoration and reverence and belief (?), whence are to be drawn all consolations, all inspiration and aids to right-doing. The veriest fetich worshipper, who fancies his god to reside in the stick which his own hand has carved, renders a worship purer, more rational, higher, and more dignified a thousand times, incomparably, than all Agnostics together, who, in the arrogance of their conceit, would erect temples, richer than Solomon's, to this vague, formless, indefinite abstraction of their own vapid intellects.

Mr. Harrison has decidedly the advantage over Mr. Spencer in this matter of religious worship. He has accepted the latter premiss of the unknowable, and argued it out to its legitimate conclusion, wherein all religion evaporates into such rhetoric as Mr. Harrison wittily disperses over his pages. Mr. Harrison is logical at least, when he accepts the fatal doctrine of the unknowable, for it necessarily ends in that "ghost of religion," humanity! The flaw of both lies in the adoption of the absurdity which Mr. Spencer has laid down in the beginning, an utterly inconceivable god, which the human mind annihilates in its attempt to think of it. Neither humanity nor the unknowable can ever be the proper object of religious worship. Mr. Spencer rightly rejects Mr. Harrison's folly of humanity, and Mr. Harrison properly repudiates Mr. Spencer's absurdity of the unknowable. Both are *simulacra*, engendered by "persistent misconception along certain defined grooves of thought." Reason, so far from being exalted, is debased by the acceptance of either. Man's only dignity consists in having come from God, who has created him to know Him, the Truth. And "I, for one, cannot think there is such a radical vice in the constitution of things" as to suppose that man's intellect was made to conceive the highest truth a lie.

THE WAGE QUESTION.

SOME years ago, when the "labor question" had not nearly acquired the prominence it now has, a thoughtful writer declared that in the near future the chief contentions in society would not be so much about political institutions and civil rights as about the relations and respective rights of employers and employees. The present state of things in Europe and in this country fully verifies this prediction. The subjects about which the people, as a whole, are most deeply concerned are not political, but industrial. In England, and Scotland, and Ireland there has been an extension of the right of suffrage, yet this concession to a million or more of persons who previously had no voice in electing members of Parliament and shaping the political policy of Great Britain created only a slight ripple on the surface of public opinion and was accepted without excitement and without any special manifestation of gladness or rejoicing by the industrial classes, to whom it was extended.

They are more deeply concerned about their material condition, about the wages they receive and the securing of permanent and remunerative employment, than whether or not they have the right to vote at elections for members of Parliament or for county or municipal officers.

So, too, in Germany and in France, the majority of the people of those countries concern themselves far less about the political institutions under which they live than about the questions which immediately relate to their industrial condition and the securing of the largest and most certain return for their daily labor.

The same fact confronts us in this country. Convince the voter in the United States that the placing of any political party in power would add twenty-five cents per day to his wages without any increase of time or of the work he is required to do, and the popular vote would immediately turn in favor of that party.

It is plainly the industrial question, in one or another of its forms, that determines how both employers and employees, or, as they are commonly styled, capitalists and workingmen, shall cast their votes. The questions about duties on imports from foreign countries, about a tariff or a free-trade policy, the questions connected with our shipping and commercial interests, our railroads and our banking interests, our national debt and the manner of paying it, the questions about the rights and powers of corporate

companies and the extent to which those rights and powers should be limited, and like questions, all turn upon the manner in which the different policies proposed by opposing parties will affect the interests of capitalists and wage-payers on the one hand and those of workingmen or wage-workers on the other. The wage question, or, in other words, the question how wage-workers may assert and maintain their rights as against wage-payers, has practically become *the* question of our age.

In the thoughts which we propose to present on this subject we have no intention to attempt to discuss the relation of capital and labor in the abstract. Countless such disquisitions have been written and published, yet seemingly to very little purpose. We doubt whether they have ever really influenced, to any important extent, the action either of employers or of employees in the conflicts which are constantly occurring between them.

The question of wages is a practical one. It cannot and will not be solved by references to abstract principles of political economy or social philosophy, but by concrete facts. It is a question, too, which has become the question of the day in its relation to all temporal or material interests.

This may seem to some persons a very mercenary way of looking at the subject. Yet it is not. At least it is the natural way, and the way the subject is actually looked at by the vast majority of persons. "All that a man hath he will give for his life," and where wife and children are also concerned, he will give it all the more readily. It is mere mockery to concede to a man the right to go to the polls and vote for or against candidates for offices, whilst he himself is virtually a pauper living from hand to mouth, and dependent on the will of his employer whether he and his family shall have bread to eat or not.

The right to live, and to live as a being endowed with reason and will should live, comes first in the natural order. Political rights follow both in the order of nature and of relative importance. Political rights, too, are simply means to secure certain ends, and one of these ends is that of protecting the weak against the strong, the feeble many against the powerful few, in the efforts of the former to secure a certain and a decent livelihood.

We are well aware that many persons will probably dissent from these statements when made in the broad and naked manner in which we have put them. Yet facts of every-day occurrence around us prove their truth. The attempts made from time to time to organize a "labor party" in the United States are all based upon the belief that the "wage question" is of greater practical importance to those who work for wages than any question

of politics which divides the people of the United States into Republicans and Democrats.

These continual attempts to form a labor party may be well-advised or ill-advised; but whichever they be, the attempts themselves show that in the minds of those who make them the wage question dwarfs and subordinates to itself all mere political questions.

And, to adduce evidence of much wider range, it is an indisputable fact that of the many millions of persons who have migrated to this country from Ireland, Germany and other European countries, the vast majority sought our shores less from political reasons than from the hope of improving their material and industrial condition. It was not—at least not chiefly—because they had few or no political rights or privileges in their native countries, but because their labor was poorly recompensed and they hoped to better their condition, in this respect, in the United States.

The truth of this statement is confirmed by the fact that many of these emigrants cherish the hope of returning to their native countries as soon as they can acquire a competency sufficient to enable them to live there in comfort. Moreover, it is a fact that thousands of the native-born citizens of the United States, if remunerative employment and personal safety are assured to them, are willing and ready to leave this country and go to foreign countries, with little or no concern for the differences which such action will make in their political rights and privileges.

Were other proof needed of the prominent position which the wage question now occupies, it would be furnished by the rapidity with which associations of "trades-unions" of various kinds have been organized, and the vast numbers of persons whom they have enrolled. There is scarcely any form of industrial activity in which the wage-workers have not formed one of these societies. Of late years, too, efforts have been made to combine all these associations together into a common confederacy or union. And these efforts seem to be succeeding. One form of this movement,—that of the "Knights of Labor,"—if recent statements respecting their numerical strength can be relied on, have upwards of three hundred thousand members on their rolls.

The wage question is confounded by some persons with communistic and socialistic theories. But this is a mistake. It is true that socialistic and communistic agitators endeavor to win over the wage-workers to their support. But they have met with little success thus far. It is also true that among the wage-workers there are some who are avowed socialists or communists. But the number of these is few. There is not only no necessary connection between the efforts of wage-workers to better their con-

dition, as regards wages and hours of work, and the crazy dreams of socialists and communists, but their fundamental ideas are antagonistic.

Communism aims at the abolition of individual ownership of property. Its leading idea is that individuals have no exclusive personal right in anything they possess; no right in fact to possess and enjoy anything exclusively; that of right there is no such thing as individual ownership, but that all things should be owned in common, and be distributed to individuals to use and enjoy according to rules and regulations of the entire community or of officials which the commune should elect and appoint. The phrase "property is robbery" states correctly the fundamental notion of communism.

Socialism contemplates such a reconstruction of human society that all human productive action shall be regulated by the State. It would make, were it carried into practical effect, each individual a mere atom of the entire social aggregate, having no rights apart from or independent of that aggregate, and without personal freedom or personal choice as to what he shall do, when he shall work, or to what use the fruits of his labor shall be put.

But the wage question contemplates nothing of this kind. Its fundamental intention is summed up in the phrase, "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work." It does not aim at robbing employers of even a single dollar of property which they have individually acquired. It does not deny to them the right of increasing their possessions fairly and honestly, and without injustice, fraud, or oppression of their employees.

Taken as a whole, wage-workers have no sympathy with socialistic or communistic theories. Wage-workers are just as anxious to acquire individual property as are wage-payers; just as anxious to have houses and lands of their own, which shall be homes for them and their families; just as anxious to lay up money "against a rainy day," and enough of it to enable them to live comfortably and raise their children decently, and give them a fair start in life when they have grown up.

There are exceptions to this, of course; but these exceptions do not affect the truth of what we have said. Wage-workers look at the subject in a practical way. They know that their labor is the active producing cause of the wealth their employers acquire, and they feel that it is but just that their labor should be fairly compensated.

Until a few years ago, the wage question in the United States was one of easy practical solution in most cases. The demand for labor was such that if a wage-worker was dissatisfied with his work or with his wages, he could easily obtain other employment that

would remunerate him ; then, too, there was a constant movement from the position of wage-worker to that of wage-payer.

But this is no longer the case except to a very limited extent. The influx of emigrants from European countries, and the substitution of machinery for hand-work, have increased the supply of laborers beyond the demand for them. Consequently, when a wage-worker relinquishes a situation, or is discharged from it, he usually finds it very difficult to obtain work elsewhere.

Then, too, the rapid accumulation of capital in enormous amounts and the concentration of all our most important industries into the hands of a few persons or incorporated companies, closely united in syndicates or combinations, which exercise an irresistible power over individual action outside of these combinations, make it extremely difficult for wage-workers to exercise any influence, or to have any voice in deciding what wages they shall receive or how long they shall work. There is scarcely any mutuality between wage-workers and their employers. The wages which the former shall receive and the latter shall pay, is no longer a question for free discussion and free bargain and sale. The question is practically decided by the employers looking at the subject from their own point of view, and without reference to their employees, their condition, rights, or interests. The only liberty the wage-workers commonly can exercise, is the liberty of working or not working for the wages and on the terms which are prescribed by their employers.

Under these circumstances, a vast amount of the talk about wage-workers having a right and being free to put their own price upon their work, and to sell their labor or not as they may choose, is simply not pertinent to the question in the shape it has practically assumed. It is true in principle, but it is a principle which the vast majority of wage-workers are entirely unable to avail themselves of under existing circumstances. Naturally and in justice they have the right to exercise and enjoy this freedom, but, circumstanced as they are, they have not the power necessary to its exercise and enjoyment. The superior controlling power of combinations of capitalists and the needy condition of wage-workers unite to create this inability.

In the majority of instances, therefore, it is sheer mockery to say that wage-workers are free to accept or reject the terms and conditions that are proffered to them. As well say that the man who is loaded down with chains and shackles is at liberty to run—if he can. The man who yields up his money under the compulsion of a knife at his throat or a bludgeon brandished over his head, has no true freedom of choice or action. So, too, with the

wage-worker who receives wages prescribed to him under the condition that he accept those wages or starve.

We shall indulge in no rhetorical enlargement upon this truth. We simply state the naked fact. To us it appears to be as arbitrary and tyrannical an exercise of superior power as the act of a slave-owner who prescribes to his slaves the length of time they shall toil and the amount of work they shall do, without regard to their comfort, their health, and their strength.

The slave has the liberty of working or not working, subject to the penalty of being lashed and tortured if he refuses to work. In very many instances the wage-worker has like liberty, subject to the penalty of starvation or pauperism for himself and his family. If he refuses to accept the terms of his employer, the only alternatives left him are—to starve, to become a tramp, or a public pauper.

No one who looks actual facts squarely in the face and seriously considers them can controvert this statement or think that we have spoken too strongly. Our daily newspapers are constantly describing the manner of living and the wages paid to hundreds of thousands of wage-workers in our large cities and towns, and in mines and quarries in the country. Are these wage-workers actually *free* to sell their labor for the price they put upon it? Are they *free* to work or not to work for the wages paid by their employers? To ask these questions is to answer them.

Let us look at the actual facts of the wage question as it stands connected with some of the leading industries of Pennsylvania.

The mining of iron ore furnishes employment to a very large number of persons, and provides the raw material for one of our most important industries. What the actual condition is of the men who toil in those mines, and what wages they receive, may be inferred from the following remarks on the subject, made by the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania, in his official report upon the industries of the State :

“The mining of iron ore does not afford constant employment, the average amounting to but thirty-six weeks per annum. This allows scarcely sufficient wages per week, for the run of the year, to maintain a single individual. How those wage-workers having families to maintain can accomplish that difficult task is a problem in social economics that can be solved only by those who have been in similar circumstances. Many miners wear belts instead of suspenders to support the weight of their pantaloons, and one of these, in reply to the question asked him relative to his ability to buy food, replied : ‘ Lord bless you, we don’t always eat when we are hungry, *we just tighten our belts.* ’ ”

To show what is the average actual condition of the wage-workers in the iron-ore mines in Pennsylvania, we give two tables

taken from the official report on Industrial Statistics of Pennsylvania for the year 1884. These tables are not made up from returns from any particular mine, or from the mines of any particular locality, but by averaging the entire aggregate of returns from the whole State.

The first of these tables, entitled "Theoretical Wages," is an exhibit of the wages, per week and per year, of wage-workers in and about iron-ore mines, on the basis of constant employment during the whole year.

TABLE I.—*Iron-Ore Mines ; Theoretical Wages.*

Employees.	Daily Wages.	Weekly Wages.	Yearly Wages.
Miners,	\$1 25	\$7 50	\$390
Miners' helpers,	1 17	7 02	365
Engineers,	1 30	7 80	406
Foremen,	1 75	10 50	546
Blacksmiths,	1 40	8 40	437
Laborers,	95	5 70	296
Boys,	50	3 00	156
All others,	1 25	7 50	390

The foregoing exhibit is made up by tabulating returns made by the employers of labor in the iron-ore mines of Pennsylvania. But when this exhibit is tested and scaled down to the amounts actually paid by them to their employees, the figures reduce themselves to those contained in the following table :

TABLE II.—*Iron-Ore Mines ; Exhibit of Actual Wages.*

Employees.	Weekly Wages.	Annual Wages.
Miners,	\$4 50	\$270
Miners' helpers,	4 20	250
Engineers,	4 70	281
Foremen,	6 30	378
Blacksmiths,	5 04	302
Laborers,	3 41	205
Boys,	1 80	108
All others,	4 50	270

To explain more clearly how these tables have been made up we quote the statement respecting them of the Secretary of Internal Affairs for the State of Pennsylvania. He says :

"In the compilation of the tables of wages paid to wage-workers in Pennsylvania, we have deemed it proper to travel out of the beaten path. . . . Table I. shows the *highest* rates of wages paid per diem, multiplied by six full working days, to show the *highest* weekly wages, and this multiplied by fifty-two, to show the highest annual wages. Table II. gives the average daily wages, multiplied by the number of days *actually* employed per annum, and this product divided by fifty-two shows the actual weekly wages paid and received."

These tables show, by comparing them, how the general public are systematically deceived and deluded as regards the actual wages received by toilers in the iron-ore mines of Pennsylvania, and as regards their actual condition. Table II. tells the ghastly truth, and yet, not the whole truth. For even from the scanty wages exhibited in Table II. deductions are made for various reasons and pretexts not shown in the table. And while we are writing this, to-day's issue of a Philadelphia paper is before us, containing the statement that the present wages in the ore-mines of the most extensive iron-ore region in Pennsylvania are fifty cents per day, and sixty cents for experts.

Another of the leading industries of Pennsylvania, is that of mining coal. At different times, and according to the activity of the coal trade, it employs from 120,000 to 150,000 miners, laborers, and mechanics. The tables which we shall give below are taken from the official report on the industries of Pennsylvania for the year 1884. They have been prepared from the reports of operators who employed about 82,000 wage-workers in the anthracite coal-mines, and about 37,000 wage-workers in the bituminous coal-mines.

Respecting these tables the Secretary of Internal Affairs says :

"The great difference between theoretical wages and actual wages, is to be accounted for by the difference actually existing between theoretical working time and actual time employed. This difference amounts to one hundred and twenty-eight days in the anthracite, and one hundred and ten days in the bituminous coal-fields."

We first give the tables which exhibit respectively the theoretical and the actual wages in the anthracite coal regions :

TABLE I.—*Exhibit of Highest Average Wages in the Anthracite Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on full Working Time.*

Theoretical Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners on contract,	\$2 70	\$16 20	\$842 40
Miners on wages,	2 00	12 00	624 00
Laborers, inside,	1 78	10 68	555 36
Laborers, outside,	1 40	8 40	436 80
Boys,	65	3 90	202 80
Drivers and runners,	1 43	8 58	446 18
Firemen,	1 58	9 48	492 96
Engineers,	1 88	11 28	586 56
Blacksmiths,	1 91	11 46	595 92
Slate-pickers, boss,	1 55	9 30	483 60
Slate-pickers, boys,	50	3 00	156 00

Were this "theoretical" exhibit realized in actual fact by wage-workers in the anthracite coal-fields, there would be little reason

for complaint, and we are inclined to think that the wage-workers would not complain. But the table of actual wages, which we give below, shows that the foregoing table is simply a "word of promise to the ear, but broken to the hope."

Compare now with that table the one which follows :

TABLE II.—*Exhibit of Actual Wages at the Anthracite Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Actual Time Employed.*

Actual Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners on contract,	\$2 70	\$8 84	\$459 68
Miners on wages,	2 00	7 00	364 00
Laborers, inside,	1 78	6 14	319 28
Laborers, outside,	1 40	4 91	255 32
Boys,	65	2 07	107 64
Drivers and runners,	1 43	5 32	276 64
Firemen,	1 58	5 73	297 96
Engineers,	1 88	8 84	459 68
Blacksmiths,	1 91	7 16	372 32
Slate-pickers, boss,	1 55	5 60	291 20
Slate-pickers, boys,	50	1 70	88 40

By glancing from one to the other of these tables the vast difference between the "theoretical" and the actual condition, as regards wages, of the toilers at the anthracite coal-mines, will be seen.

To save the trouble of a laborious comparison we tabulate the differences, per week and per year :

TABLE III.—*Exhibit of Differences between Theoretical and Actual Wages, and Consequent Loss, per Week and per Year, at the Anthracite Mines of Pennsylvania.*

Employees.	Loss of Wages.	
	Per Week.	Per Year.
Miners on contract,	\$7 36	\$382 72
Miners on wages,	5 00	260 00
Laborers, inside,	4 54	236 08
Laborers, outside,	3 48	180 96
Boys,	1 83	95 16
Drivers and runners,	3 26	169 52
Firemen,	3 75	195 00
Engineers,	2 44	126 88
Blacksmiths,	4 30	223 60
Slate-pickers, boss,	3 70	192 40
Slate-pickers, boys,	1 30	67 60

In the bituminous coal regions a like discrepancy exists between the nominal or theoretical and the actual wages, as the following tables prove. They show, too, that the condition of wage-workers in the bituminous coal-fields is even worse than that of wage-workers in the anthracite coal-fields :

TABLE I.—*Exhibit of Highest Average Wages Paid in the Bituminous Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Full Working Time.*

Theoretical Wages. Employees.	Day.	Week.	Year.
Miners,	\$2 00	\$12 00	\$624 00
Laborers, inside,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Laborers, outside,	1 60	9 60	499 20
Mule drivers,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Blacksmiths,	2 00	12 00	624 00
Coke-oven chargers,	1 70	10 20	530 40
Coke-oven drawers,	1 65	9 90	514 80
Mine boss,	2 80	16 80	873 00
Carpenters,	1 75	10 50	546 00
Clerks,	2 25	13 50	702 00
Boys,	60	3 60	187 20

How woefully short of this "theoretical exhibit" are the actual wages of the workers in the bituminous coal-fields of Pennsylvania is shown by the table which immediately follows :

TABLE II.—*Exhibit of Actual Wages Paid in the Bituminous Coal Mines of Pennsylvania, Based on Actual Time Employed.*

Actual Wages. Employees.	Per Day.	Per Week.	Per Year.
Miners,	\$2 00	\$7 10	\$369 20
Laborers, inside,	1 75	6 30	327 60
Laborers, outside,	1 60	5 61	291 72
Mule drivers,	1 75	6 20	322 40
Blacksmiths,	2 00	7 20	374 40
Coke-oven chargers,	1 70	6 04	314 08
Coke-oven drawers,	1 65	5 68	305 36
Mine boss,	2 80	12 00	624 00
Carpenters,	1 75	7 00	364 00
Clerks,	2 25	10 00	520 00
Boys,	60	2 70	140 40

After examining this latter table, the fact must be considered that these "actual" wages are subject to various drawbacks and deductions enforced against employees, and which their necessitous condition compels them to submit to. These drawbacks and deductions amount to from twenty to twenty-five per cent. of wages that the employees are credited with upon their employers' books. When this fact is taken into consideration, it becomes evident that it is scarcely possible for the wage-workers to obtain for themselves and their families mere subsistence, not to speak of a decent and comfortable livelihood. There seems to be no opportunity or chance, even, of them rising above the condition of mere serfs, compelled to toil hopelessly during life, on the terms and conditions which their employers prescribe.

To show more clearly the discrepancy between the "theoretical" wages of employees in the bituminous coal-fields, as furnished by

employers, and published from time to time in our newspapers, and the actual wages (excluding, too, even, drawbacks and deductions commonly made from them), we give below a table compiled by the Secretary of Internal Affairs, exhibiting the losses incurred per week by wage-workers, owing to irregular employment. To this table we have added a column, showing from the same official figures the losses per year :

Exhibit of Differences Between Theoretical and Actual Wages Paid per Week [and per Year] in Bituminous Mines in Pennsylvania.

Employees.	Wages, Loss per Week.	Wages, Loss per Year.
Miners,	\$4 90	\$254 80
Laborers, inside,	4 20	218 40
Laborers, outside,	3 99	207 48
Mule drivers,	3 30	223 60
Blacksmiths,	4 80	249 60
Coke-oven chargers,	4 16	216 32
Coke-oven drawers,	4 22	219 44
Mine boss,	4 80	249 60
Carpenters,	3 50	182 00
Clerks,	3 50	182 00
Boys,	90	46 80

By comparing this table of "losses" per week and per year of wage-workers in the bituminous coal regions in Pennsylvania, owing to irregular employment, with the table of actual wages credited them, a clearer idea will be obtained of their real condition. The brief comment of the Secretary of Internal Affairs upon this point contains a ghastly truth, the deep significance of which is well worth pondering over ; " It must be confessed," he says, " that the weekly wages of Pennsylvania coal operatives is not calculated to admit of a saving fund against the day of sickness or disaster. . . . Looking at the result, and it is one that has been obtained after full and impartial investigation, we are forced to the conclusion that more steady and certain employment throughout the year to employees in the coal fields of Pennsylvania would be more beneficial to the wage-workers than would a nominal rise in daily wages. Not that we think that the present daily wages are sufficient, but rather that the daily wages paid under the present system of broken time is calculated to deceive the wage-workers themselves, who, for the most part, forget the past danger of uncertainty in their employments, and, with a generous hope, multiply their certain daily wages by a certain full time which, alas! never comes."

The space allowed us is limited, and this fact prevents us from going into details of the wages and condition of wage-workers in

other industrial pursuits of Pennsylvania. But, as bearing on the subject, and as containing statistics which are well worthy of careful study, we give the following tabulated exhibit of the average weekly wages of all wage-workers in the principal industries in Pennsylvania, compiled by the Secretary of Internal Affairs. The explanatory title of the table is:

An Exhibit of the Average Weekly Wages of all Wage-Workers in the Several Industries of Pennsylvania Named, Supposing the Annual Amounts of Wages Paid in each Industry were Divided Equally among all the Wage-Workers in the Special Industry from which the Annual Wage Fund is Obtained.

Industries.	Weekly Wages.	Industries.	Weekly Wages.
Agricultural implements, . . .	\$ 8 00	Iron foundries, . . .	\$11 40
Axes and saws, . . .	8 80	Lasts, . . .	7 75
Bessemer steel, . . .	12 17	Milling, flour and grist, . . .	5 04
Blast furnaces, . . .	8 50	Malt, . . .	8 80
Bloomeries, . . .	8 12	Neckwear, . . .	7 25
Brass foundries, . . .	9 80	Ores, iron, . . .	4 80
Boilers and engines, . . .	8 56	Oilcloths, . . .	5 17
Bridges, . . .	9 00	Oil refineries, . . .	7 00
Boots and shoes, . . .	8 00	Paper, . . .	7 15
Breweries, . . .	12 00	Paints, . . .	9 33
Bricks, common, . . .	3 00	Planing mills, . . .	8 00
Bricks, fire, . . .	6 00	Potteries, . . .	7 66
Brushes, . . .	3 20	Rolling mills, . . .	8 00
Carpets, . . .	6 71	Sawmills, . . .	5 29
Cigars, . . .	7 08	Slate quarries, . . .	6 10
Cotton cloth, . . .	5 10	Sugar refineries, . . .	9 25
Crucible steel, . . .	11 00	Soap and candles, . . .	8 20
Crucibles, . . .	16 60	Show cases, . . .	9 50
Cordage, . . .	4 80	Silk, . . .	4 00
Coal, anthracite, . . .	6 91	Shirts, . . .	5 00
Coal, bituminous, . . .	7 20	Stoves and ranges, . . .	11 00
Distilleries, . . .	8 20	Tanneries, . . .	7 50
Furniture, . . .	8 75	Trunks, . . .	8 00
Glass, window, . . .	11 50	Toys, . . .	3 64
Glass, flint and green, . . .	8 00	Terra cotta, . . .	9 80
Glass, sand, . . .	5 80	Type foundries, . . .	5 43
General machinery, . . .	9 25	Umbrellas and parasols, . . .	6 04
Hats and caps, . . .	4 00	Upholstery goods, . . .	6 16
Harness, . . .	8 00	Woollen goods, . . .	5 40

With regard to this table the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania says:

"The general average of the above would be (if we take into consideration the proportion of employees to the industries named in the table) about seven dollars and a half per week. This sum will not permit of any extravagant habits, and any diminution of it must inevitably compel the average wage-worker to abstain from the purchase of those necessities of life which, at the time, seem

most convenient to dispense with. To lessen the wages of a body of wage-workers is, in effect, to cause an 'over-production,' so called, of manufactured products, since the average wage-worker, in order to meet the requirements of nature and those wants incident to his station in life, must, in the event of a reduction of wages, either go in debt and satisfy those wants, or economize, and, consequently, leave the manufactured or other product in the hands of the dealer; hence an over-production, which is but the result of an enforced under-consumption."

A few more brief comments on the volume before us, and we reluctantly dismiss it. The Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania has, with much pains and labor, compiled various tables comparing the differences in condition as regards wages, cost of food, house rent, etc., of wage-workers in Pennsylvania and in European countries. After an exhaustive comparison of the facts and tables of cost of food which he gives, the conclusion is that the English, and Scotch, and Irish wage-worker lives at less expense for food, and food which better maintains his physical strength, than does the wage-worker in the United States.

It may be our climate; it may be wrongly-cultivated tastes and desires; but whatever be the cause, it seems to be *necessary* for the wage-worker in the United States, in order to keep up the muscle and energy required for his work, to consume more expensive food than in England, Scotland, Ireland, or any other trans-Atlantic country.

So, too, as regards house-rent, fuel, clothing, and medical attendance. As regards fuel, the wage-workers in England and Scotland usually get it at a nominal sum, merely covering the actual cost of delivery. In the United States the full market price, or more than that, is charged. The average house-rent charged for tenements in our coal regions is five dollars per month, a rent-charge which is equal to from twenty to forty per cent. annually upon the actual cost. And that the discomfort to which wage-workers are subject as regards their dwellings is not owing to their wilful neglect, the Secretary of Internal Affairs testifies as follows: "The majority of wage-workers in Pennsylvania live in houses . . . that, in most cases, are clean, and bearing evidence of good management by tidy housewives."

Another element of the wage-question is commented upon in the volume before us. It is that of "Company Stores and Store Orders." We condense the remarks on this subject. "Operators, in many instances, report the amount of wages paid wage-workers as actual money paid them, when the facts would warrant them in reporting fully two-thirds of the amount as *groceries* and *provisions* paid in lieu of money. . . . The system of 'company stores'

robs the wage-workers of an amount of money it is impossible to calculate, but enough is known to warrant the inference that he who, forced by circumstances, is obliged to accept store orders or deal at the 'company store' is at the mercy of his employer."

And just this system of accepting orders on the "company's store" in lieu of wages, is generally enforced by employers on their employees throughout both the anthracite and the bituminous coal regions. It is forbidden by legislative enactments, but those enactments are defied or evaded. One of the methods for doing this, and one which operates most disadvantageously to wage-workers, even where the "company store" system does not exist, is the practice of withholding wages for the period of a month before payment. That wages could be paid at shorter intervals, without detriment to employers, is proved by the fact that in England they are usually paid "once a week," or "once a fortnight." With regard to this, the Secretary of Internal Affairs makes the following significant remark:

"The rule in Pennsylvania is to withhold the bulk of the wages for a period of one month before paying, and, in some cases, a certain percentage of wages is withheld as a guarantee fund against the violation, on the part of the miners, of certain iron-clad contracts, so-called, framed to evade laws passed for the better protection of miners."

"In this same connection, and as having a direct relation to our subject, we quote the following statement of the Secretary of Internal Affairs:

". . . . From the reports made of difficulties, antagonisms, and strikes, it would appear that little real harmony exists between the employer and the employed. Capital [*Capitalists* would be more accurate] too often regards the laborer with little or any more consideration than a beast of burden, while the laborer, too often with justice, esteems the employer, if not an absolute oppressor, yet as often wanting in human feeling toward him. That such a state of things should exist is unfortunate, but a careful examination of the question renders such conclusion imperative."

In further evidence of who are chiefly to blame for the existing antagonisms between wage-payers and wage-workers, according to the opinion of the Secretary of Internal Affairs, we quote the following statements:

"From statistics and reports received, the following conclusions have been reached:

"That the wage-worker, as a rule, is frugal, temperate, and industrious. The amount of wages paid does not admit of intemperate or improvident habits.

"That the present amount of wages annually paid does not give

to the wage-worker comfortable means of support and enable him to lay by even a moderate fund to meet the necessary exigencies he is almost certain to encounter.

"That wage-workers receive in wages *one-third less* than is generally accredited to them, owing to the fact that the accredited wages per diem are not the average for computation throughout the year, without due allowance is made for unemployed time. *Enforced idleness* is more disastrous than the low rate of wages.

"That steady and certain employment is more important to the wage-worker than a nominal advance in per diem wages."

"An evil growing out of present conditions is shown by the increase of child-labor, and this *cannot be prevented* until the head of the family is enabled by his own labor to earn an *adequate support*.

"The great mass of the community is composed of wage-workers. It is essential to the present and future welfare of the State that labor should be justly and adequately paid.

"It is the true interest of the employer as well as of the employee, and it should be the aim of the employer, not only to pay just wages to the extent of his ability, but also to protect the employees from casualties to life and limbs, so often occurring by reason of the neglect of proper safeguards."

These are the conclusions not of a wage-worker in the technical sense of the word, but rather of an employer, after a careful survey of the whole field of industrial labor in Pennsylvania and possessed of the best possible means of accurate information. In view of the facts and statistics we have presented (and they are but a small part of what we might exhibit), it seems evident to our mind that the reason why the wage question is a source of constant strife and contention, instead of amicable adjustment, lies chiefly at the door of employers rather than of employees. This remark, too, holds good with respect to the United States generally. For while we have confined our statistical statements to Pennsylvania, yet if the view be extended to our country as a whole, it will be found that wage-workers in Pennsylvania are, to say the least, in no worse condition than in other States.

Between capital and labor, strictly speaking, there is not and cannot be antagonism. Both enter into and are conjoined inseparably in every form of human industry. The one is the product of the other, and neither can prosper separately. But this is aside from the real practical question. While *capital* and *labor* are not antagonistic, it is a fact of every-day experience that *capitalists* and *laborers* are constantly in antagonism.

It is unfortunate, and not only unfortunate but wrong, that this

should be the case. For owing to it both classes suffer, and society at large, which is almost entirely composed of them, also suffers.

The real practical question, therefore, is, at whose door lies the wrong? And if both are in the wrong, to what extent and in what way?

The discussion of these questions would open up another and a very interesting branch of the general subject, which limitation of space forbids us entering upon.

There are however some important facts bearing on the subject which, though little thought of, are so well known, that we need adduce no proof of them, but simply state them.

The duties of wage-workers in their relation to wage-payers, to themselves, and to society are preached *ad nauseam* from press and pulpit. They are told that they should be temperate, patient, contented, respectful, honest, and just, and that they should consider and strive to promote the interests of those from whom they receive wages. If they violate those duties they are summarily denounced, their shortcomings, their unreasonable demands, their inconsiderate disregard of their employer's position or necessities with reference to his business, their rash acts of violence to persons or property, are swiftly exposed and unsparingly denounced.

But there is singular reticence with regard to equally censurable violations of duty when committed by employers. That side of the case is seldom depicted, and when it is it is done usually in colors so faint and indistinct that it attracts little attention. The public press seldom alludes to it, nor does the pulpit, and when they do the reference is so general that its point and special application are unfelt.

A glaring example of this is furnished by the manner in which the public press practically ignores notorious frauds upon wage workers which are constantly practiced by coal operators and other capitalists, and by incorporated companies, with regard to weights and measures employed in determining the amount of work done by employees. Scales are so manipulated, and mine cars of falsely reported capacity are employed to reduce by ten, twenty, or thirty per cent. the amounts of wages which the employees have fairly earned, and which should be placed to their credit. If butchers or farmers are caught selling fifteen ounces of beef or butter for a pound, or retailers of dry-goods in measuring off calico at the rate of thirty inches for a yard, they quickly suffer the penalties of the law, and are regarded by the public as common cheats and scoundrels. But year by year frauds of far greater extent are practiced, notoriously, in our coal regions by coal operators and mining companies without detriment to the social standing of the

operators, nor of the presidents and directors of those companies, and without their being made amenable in any way to law.

The complaints of the miners against this practice were so earnest that some years ago a law was enacted in Pennsylvania prohibiting it, and providing that the capacity of the mine cars should be ascertained and registered by a specially authorized officer, and that at each mine a "check-boss" or weighmaster might be appointed by the miners. But the penalties for disobeying the law are sadly defective. The law is notoriously disregarded. Yet we have never heard of a single instance in which the operators or owners of coal mines, or the presidents or directors of coal companies, or their superintendents, have been fined or imprisoned, or in any way punished for violating this law. Only a few days ago the operatives in the Clearfield and Broad Top coal region published a list of complaints, one of which was that the scales at the mines were so arranged that they showed less than the true weight of coal in each mine car. They declared that their check-boss or weight-inspector was not allowed to touch the scales, and that all he could do was to notice the apparent weight of the cars as they rapidly passed over the falsely-adjusted scales. At other mines there are no check-bosses, and at still others there are other means employed for cheating the miners, whether the quantity of coal mined and their resulting wages be determined by weight or by measure.

These facts are widely known. There is not a newspaper in Pennsylvania that is ignorant of them, yet how seldom are they alluded to, and when alluded to, in how pointless and deprecatory manner is not the allusion made? Yet the systematic, deliberative cheating of coal operatives that is thus perpetrated amounts yearly to at least a million dollars and probably to double that sum.

Then, again, the system of keeping back wages of employees for the period of at least a month, and of frequently, too, reserving wages to a certain amount, or for a certain period, as a forfeit against employees violating "iron-clad" contracts, operates—whether in all cases intended so to do or not—to cut down wages to an extent of from ten to twenty-five per cent., according to circumstances and localities.

On this subject the recent testimony of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, an employer of thousands of workingmen, in a recent open letter published in many of our daily newspapers, is directly in point. He said that in an interview with a large body of his employees they declared that a reduction of the period of paying wages from four weeks to two weeks would be equivalent to an increase of more than five per cent. on their wages. It is needless to say that a reduction to one week would more than duplicate that percentage

of advantage to wage-workers. What gives all the more force to this testimony is that these employees are not compelled to purchase at "company stores," and are in a region where there is free competition among those from whom they procure their supplies.

The "company store" custom is a natural adjunct of this system of holding back wages. At the start of new mining operations in a secluded region there was a seeming justification for it. It was necessary that a store, or depot of supplies for the miners, convenient to the place where they worked, should be established. The individuals, or the company, operating the mines, it was argued, might as well establish the store and reap the profit from it as any one else. And the argument would be a sound one were it not for the temptations to abuse power and to exercise extortion, which experience shows the system involves. How great that abuse is, and the consequent extortion, is abundantly proved by the testimony which induced (*compelled* would, perhaps, more correctly express the truth) the Legislature of Pennsylvania to enact a prohibitory law against "company stores," as well as by the emphatic condemnation of them by the Secretary of Internal Affairs. But partly owing to defects in the law itself, and partly owing to its ineffective administration, growing out of the unwillingness of the officials whose duty it is to report and bring to justice the influential parties who disregard its provisions, it is evaded and defied to an extent that makes it virtually inoperative and dead.

Where stores are not publicly and avowedly established and maintained by "companies," or individual operators, they are virtually so, and have the same oppressive effect through operators being interested in them and receiving a percentage of the sales made to their employees. It is well understood, too, by the latter that unless they purchase their supplies at those stores they will be dismissed from employment, or, on one or another pretext, will have the most unremunerative work crowded over upon them.

Moreover, owing to the long periods that the scanty wages paid the operatives are kept back, the operatives must buy their supplies on credit. As they have no visible property which they can pledge as security, and as their wages are both scanty and precarious, the merchant, even if he have no understanding or connection with the operators, and even if he is a competitor of the company's store, puts a much higher price upon everything he sells to these miners, in order to cover the risk of losses which he incurs.

Thus wage-workers are crushed and ground beneath the upper and the lower millstone. On the one hand, they have to struggle against the tendency of employers to reduce their wages, and pay them just as little as will secure their services. On the other hand,

they have to pay higher prices for all their purchases than others who buy for cash in the open market.

These facts are perfectly well known to the writers for our newspapers and periodicals, yet few and faint are the censures pronounced upon the capitalists and companies who, for their own profit or convenience, impose these disadvantages and inflict these losses upon their employees. There are legislative enactments professedly framed to protect wage-workers from some of these abuses and methods of extortion, but they are lame and ineffective, and the controlling influence exerted by capitalists and corporations over those whose duty it is to enforce these legislative enactments practically nullifies even the little prohibitory force they have.

Under these circumstances it is not at all surprising that widespread dissatisfaction and discontent prevail among wage-workers. They feel that they are imposed on, cheated, and defrauded. They know that when trade becomes brisk and business profitable, they receive a tardy and scanty increase of wages, but when the profits of their employers are lessened, their wages are swiftly reduced.

As for the lawlessness and acts of violence of wage-workers, there are several things to be said in explanation—in explanation, but not in excuse or defence. For we can frame no apology for lawlessness.

The first of these remarks is that these acts are most frequently committed not by the wage-workers themselves, but by the “roughs and toughs and hoodlums” who, on every occasion of excitement or disturbance, are ready to take advantage of it and make it an opportunity for indulging their criminal propensities.

The second point we make is that it is not surprising if the wage-workers themselves are sometimes carried away by excitement and indignation into disregard of the requirements of the law. In the action of their employers whose exactions they are resisting and striking against, they have an example of successful evasion and defiance of law. They see that they disregard and defy numerous emphatic prohibitions of State Constitutions; that they openly evade and defy legislative enactments; that they resort to legal action when it is to their interest to do it, and that, at other times, they resist its action by employing the potent influences of wealth to bribe legislators, to control State and municipal officers, and to lame and paralyze the arm of the law when raised against corporations and capitalists in our courts of justice.

If, therefore, there is danger of wage-workers accepting the satanic gospel of disregard for law, it is because wealthy capitalists and corporations are teaching them that bad lesson, not by precept, but in the more effective and potent form of example.

The occurrences of the last few weeks or months furnish abun-

dant proof of this. Take, for example, the street passenger railways of Philadelphia. They were created for public convenience and benefit. For that reason, and that reason alone, special and extraordinary privileges were granted to them. They were permitted to occupy public streets, to the obstruction and disadvantage of other modes of travel and methods of transit and transportation. Certain specific conditions and restrictions were enacted which they were expected in good faith to perform and observe. Yet, it is a notorious fact that each and all of these corporations disregard and violate those conditions and limitations. They have taken possession of the public highways of the city, and they use them as though they were their own property, and in open disregard of the rights of all property owners along them. They were expected to supply and run a sufficient number of cars to comfortably transport the citizens who desired to use them. Instead of this, they run only such a number as will enable them to transport their passengers by crowding them together in solid masses in the passage way and on the platforms with the utmost discomfort, and often to the serious injury of health. Then, too, the conditions of their charters respecting the repairing of the streets through which their rails are laid, and respecting other matters, are notoriously violated as regards the intention and purpose of those conditions.

These plain evasions or defiant violations of law are systematically practised by the presidents and directors of these corporations; and are tacitly approved of by the stockholders—men who are leaders of society, influential citizens, and in many cases are members of Congress, of our State Legislature, of our Municipal Councils and occupants of other offices of high responsibility.

The second and last special instance we shall cite is that of the strike upon the Gould system of railroads in our Southwestern States. The particular grievances which caused this strike have not been specifically nor clearly placed before the public. Its immediate occasion was the discharge of one of the foremen of one of the repair shops of the Texas Pacific Railroad, which act was regarded by the Knights of Labor of that region as a blow struck at their whole society. But this was only the occasion of the strike. The underlying cause is alleged by the strikers to consist of arbitrary abuse of power on the part of the railroad officials and of unreasonable and oppressive conditions imposed by them upon the employees. The employees from the outset of the strike profess to be entirely willing to submit their alleged grievances to investigation and arbitration, but the railroad authorities stubbornly refuse to accede to this proposal.

The strike quickly extended to the Missouri Pacific Railroad and its branches (which connect with the Texas Pacific and furnish to it a large part of its traffic). The Governors of the four States

of Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas and Texas (the business of which States was most seriously and injuriously affected) intervened and proposed arbitration. But the proposal was unheeded by the officials of the railroads mentioned.

Then the "switchmen" of the East St. Louis railroad yards (which are the meeting point of all the railroads coming to St. Louis from the entire region of the United States east of the Mississippi River) also struck. The effect of this was to cut off St. Louis from its traffic with the East as well as with the Southwest. Yet still the railroad officials refused to listen to any terms of adjustment of the contention, save that of absolute and unconditional submission on the part of their employees.

The question has resolved itself into a question of power, viz., whether Jay Gould and his associates shall prescribe unconditionally, and without regard to the requirements of law or of justice, the terms on which their employees shall work, or whether the latter by their associated, united, strength shall be able to compel him to submit the questions at issue to fair and impartial arbitration.

We have excluded from this statement reference to the few instances of violence to property and persons which have occurred up to the time of our putting these thoughts on paper. The instances have been few, and it is alleged that the perpetrators of them were not strikers, but members of a disorderly mob of professed sympathizers, consisting of persons who are always ready to take advantage of occasions of public excitement to commit criminal acts.

In this respect the strike, up to the time of our writing these lines, is in marked contrast with the great railroad strike which some years ago extended over the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia. Then bridges, railroad cars and depots, and warehouses were burned, the civil and military power was set at defiance, and countless acts of violence to property and persons were perpetrated. But in this strike, up to the time of our writing, but one solitary instance of violent resistance of the civil power has been committed, resulting in the murder of several persons at Fort Worth, Texas. And in this instance, it is asserted by the strikers that the guilty persons were not strikers or Knights of Labor, but were men who were entirely independent of them and who acted upon their own personal lawless impulses.

Whether this be the truth, or not, it is certain that the leading officers of the Knights of Labor have earnestly and persistently counselled the members of the society to abstain from lawlessness and acts of violence. They have exhorted them to maintain patience under all circumstances and to employ only passive resistance to the obstinacy of their employers.

On the other hand, there are two points which stand forth prominently respecting this whole affair.

In the first place, the "deputy-sheriffs," or "guards," whom the railroad officials hired, were largely composed of roughs, skilled in the use of guns and revolvers, and accustomed to employ them on slightest provocation.¹ The result of this has been the reckless killing of six men and one woman for no other cause than that they were in a crowd of spectators who hooted and jeered at the "deputy sheriffs." The "railroad guards," or "deputy sheriffs," immediately fled across the Mississippi bridge. That the strikers and the excited populace of East St. Louis did not wreak vengeance, for this utterly unjustifiable slaughter, upon the railroad property and persons in its employ, was chiefly owing to the heroic exertions and impassioned appeals, patience, and respect for law, made by Mr. Hayes and Major Brown, members of the Executive Committee of the Knights of Labor. On the following night, a considerable amount of railroad property was destroyed by incendiary fires, but all the known facts lead to the conclusion that these fires were not kindled by the strikers, but by desperadoes who took advantage of the confusion and excitement to gratify their criminal propensities.

Our second remark is that there is good reason to believe that whatever decision is eventually reached as regards the questions at issue between the strikers and the railroad companies, Jay Gould and his associates are making money out of the strike. Whether the assertion be true or not, that they secretly promoted the strike, it is certain that, by the course they have pursued, they are prolonging it; and, by their manipulations of the stock market, while they keep, meanwhile, their own intentions and plans secret as regards the final settlement of the contention, it is easy to see that their gains through stock speculations will probably amount to far more than the losses they sustain through interruption of traffic over their railroads.

We conclude with the remark that it is futile for the public press to be constantly preaching platitudes respecting patience and regard for the rights of employers and respect for law, whilst the

¹ This has been denied by the railroad officials, but the following advertisement, extensively published, speaks for itself:

"LOUISVILLE AND NASHVILLE RAILROAD COMPANY.—OFFICE OF AGENT, April 6, 1886.—Ten good men from here are wanted as deputy marshals at East St. Louis, to protect Louisville and Nashville employees. Five dollars per day and board will be paid. Also, a number of platform-men can be given employment. Only men who have plenty of grit and mean business need apply. Apply at once.

"T. S. GENUNG, Agent."

The advertisement was quickly answered by men who had "plenty of grit" and "meant business;" and how they showed their "grit" and the horrible "business" they did, the sad sequel proves.

evasions and defiant violations, constantly practiced by mammoth capitalists and corporations, are ignored, condoned and tacitly approved.

We have said that wage-workers are not, as a class, lawless, nor infected with Socialistic and Communistic ideas, but how long this will continue to be the fact remains to be seen. Unless our mammoth capitalists and corporations learn and practice justice, fairness and consideration for their employees; unless they abstain from the illegal, unjust and extortionate measures of which they are notoriously guilty; unless they themselves respect and obey the law, we risk nothing in predicting that, before another generation comes upon the stage of active life, there will be, here in the United States, a social revolution that will involve indescribable confusion and destruction of property and of life.



THE DECREES OF THE THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL.

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, A.D.

MDCCCLXXXIV. Praeside Illmo. ac Revmo. Jacobo Gibbons, Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi et Delegato Apostolico. Baltimore: Typis Joannis Murphy et Sociorum. *MDCCCLXXXVI.* 8vo. Pp. cix., 321.

HERE we have printed in large, readable type, on good paper, and with typographical accuracy, the Decrees of the late Plenary Council of Baltimore. The one hundred and five first pages are a preliminary to the Decrees themselves, comprising, as they do, the letters that passed between the Holy See, the Apostolic Delegate, and the Fathers of the Council, an account of each solemn session (five in all) and its ceremonial, and finally some extracts from the minutes of the private sessions. In the edition of the Second Plenary Council of 1867, the minutes of the private sessions were given almost entire. But, in the case of the Third Plenary, this would have been impossible. The duration of the Council, prolonged, as it was, from November 9th to December 7th, the great number of those sessions (generally twice a day), and the number of topics brought under debate, swelled the

minutes of the meetings to enormous dimensions. Even when they had been carefully pared down to bare essentials by the secretaries, with all the succinctness afforded by the Latin tongue, they covered over one hundred pages of print in the large quarto edition put in type for the benefit of the Roman examiners and consultors. In the few extracts, which it was thought expedient to give from these private sessions, regard was had to what might interest most the Catholic public, and also to points which might serve as legal precedents in future Councils.

Coming now to the Decrees themselves, the first (page 1) reminds clergy and people that the enactments of the Second Plenary (1867) remain yet in full vigor of law, and are binding on all, save inasmuch as they have been repealed, altered, or amended by the Council of 1884. The last Decree in the volume (*Titulus Ultimus*, as it is technically called), to remove all doubt, and to preclude any plea in excuse for negligence or delay, solemnly declares the present legislation to become of binding effect as soon as it shall have been promulgated by the Apostolic Delegate, the Archbishop of Baltimore. Nevertheless, it is recommended, for the sake of caution and greater solemnity, that the local promulgation for provinces and sees be made in Councils and Synods respectively, especially with a view to provide the best means of giving speedy and sure effect to the new legislation.

The second Title is the only one which concerns Catholic faith. It reverently adopts whatever the Vatican Council has defined touching Reason, Revelation, the Holy Scriptures, the Infallibility of the Pope when speaking *ex cathedra*; and condemns, in conformity with the decisions of the Holy See, the errors of socialism and communism, of statolatry or State-worship, and of those who from ignorance or malice are bent on rooting out from the popular mind the true idea of Christian marriage. This was by no means necessary; for all Catholics had years ago adhered to these definitions. But it was not out of place. Let it stand on the record as a witness of the loyalty of the American Church to Christ's Vicar on earth, which will condemn our children's children if ever they deliberately shut their eyes to the light and rise up in rebellion against the truth, as happened three hundred years ago. Let it stand there as a beacon and wholesome warning to remind those who are outside of the Church and yet glory in the name of Christian, that the Catholic Church is the only teaching body left that maintains unchangeably the reverence due to Scripture and its inspiration, and that defends, in defending Christian marriage and the sacred bond of the family, the last prop of human society and Christian civilization. Individuals hold the truth in many religious organizations, but others, to any number, of the same community

may hold the contrary with impunity. Hence as a body they do not teach even those truths which are necessary to hold society together; and if they did so teach, thousands would resent it as an attempt to fetter their Gospel liberty, while others would laugh at it as an impotent assumption of an authority which no one acknowledges, and which those now usurping it have disowned a thousand times. When a Catholic hears the voice of the teaching Church, he accepts it at once as the teaching of Christ or of His Apostles. No matter how high his station, how brilliant his gifts of intellect or rich stores of knowledge, he would no more think of rejecting that voice than would the humblest convert of Corinth venture to contradict to his face the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

After an exhortation to bishops to be more heedful of their true dignity, as representatives of Christ our Lord, than of the external pomp and state by which their office is surrounded, their duties of visitation of their flocks, and of the decennial visit *ad sacra limina*, are explained and inculcated by the Council. The mode of procedure, when the See is vacant, is then given. The consultors and irremovable rectors of the diocese must be called together for the purpose of fixing on three names to be presented to the bishops of the province as suitable candidates for the vacant see. One copy of their choice of names is to be sent to the bishops and another to Rome. Their vote is to be secret and consultive only. But such, too, is the vote of the bishops. They only present the names, but it is the Pope who appoints. If the bishops reject one or more of the clergy's candidates, they must explain to Rome the motives of such rejection.

What meets us next (Tit. ii., capp. 2, 3, 4) are the office and duties of Consultors, Examiners, and Rural Deans. Of the consultors, one-half are to be named by the bishop, the other half to be proposed by the priests who are in the exercise of the ministry, and for each consultor the priest must offer three names. The consent of the consultors is never needed for any measure proceeding from episcopal authority, but their opinion must be asked in the following cases: (1) When a diocesan synod is to be convoked. (2) For the dismembering or reducing the limits of a quasi-parish. (3) For handing over to Regulars a mission or quasi-parish. (4) In the choice of a new consultor and of the examiners. (5) Where diocesan property is to be sold, bought, etc., or handled in any business way that has the form of alienation, provided the sum does not exceed five thousand dollars. If it goes beyond that amount, the opinion of the consultors must be asked for, and the additional leave of the Holy See. Consultors are chosen for three years, but if their term of office expire during vacancy of the See, they hold over till the installation of the new bishop. They are to be summoned to meet

four times, or at least twice, a year. The very name of the Examiners of the clergy explains their office. They are to preside over the *concursus* of the clergy who seek promotion to an irremovable rectorship. They must swear to do their duty faithfully and keep their hands clean from aught that might be even the shadow of a bribe. The Rural Deans, otherwise known as *Vicarii Foranei* (outside vicars), may be appointed or not by the bishop according to his judgment, for they can only be needed in a diocese where the number of the country clergy is very large. In poor dioceses, and where priests are very few, as in the South and the far West, they are not needed. Their duty is to preside at theological conferences held in the country, to watch over Church discipline in their section, and to report to the bishop whatever may need correction or any other intervention of authority.

The next chapter (V.) treats of Irremovable Rectors. Certain missions or churches are to be selected by the bishop with the advice of his consultors, to which irremovable rectors are to be assigned, who are permanently instituted as they are in England. Their station in such a church is not a *benefice*, properly so-called, but may be regarded in some way as *ad instar beneficii*, inasmuch as the incumbent cannot be deprived except in legal form and after due process, which is fully explained in other decrees of the Council (Nos. 38, 308-316; and in the Appendix, pp. 287-292, 293-297). The proportion of irremovable to removable rectors shall be as one to ten. Those who apply for the position of irremovable rector must be examined, in presence of the bishop or his vicar, by at least three examiners, both in writing and *viva voce*, in Moral and Dogmatic Theology, Liturgy, and Canon Law. Besides, he must handle catechetically one or two questions from the Catechism to give proof of his ability to instruct his flock in Christian Doctrine, and to the same end write a sermon upon some Gospel text chosen by the examiners. All precautions must be taken to make the examination thorough and conscientious. The moral standing of the candidates must also be diligently investigated. The examiners are bound to submit not only the name of the one whom they judge the most worthy, but the names of all candidates whom they have found really and truly worthy of the office, for the selection lies not with them, but with the bishop. If there be only one vacancy, those who have been judged competent, and have not been promoted, will be considered worthy of promotion, should a vacancy occur during the next six years. After that period, if they still aspire to promotion, they must undergo a new examination.

Some of what was enacted in the 7th chapter of the same Title (regarding priests ordained for a diocese, or lawfully adopted into

it) has been rendered superfluous by a privilege lately obtained from Rome (November 22d, 1885), in virtue of which henceforth a priest ordained for any diocese may go to serve the missions of another diocese within the same province, with the consent of both Ordinaries, without the necessity of taking a new oath. This provision is also, to some extent, retroactive. Those already ordained for one diocese may transfer their services to another diocese, provided it be in the same province and with the good will of both Ordinaries. In this latter case, the consent of the Holy See, which has heretofore been an essential requisite, is no longer needed; but the transferred priest must take a new oath. Neither in the case of priests ordained since the Rescript of 1885 is there any further need of recourse to the Holy See, since it is understood that the meaning of the oath is no longer limited to one diocese, but extends to the whole province. The concluding paragraphs of the same chapter treat of priests who have been disabled for the further exercise of the ministry by sickness or old age, or who, by their own fault, have rendered themselves morally incapable of exercising any longer their sacred functions. For the support of the former the bishop, taking counsel of his clergy, must provide either by taxing the parishes or the salaries of the clergy, or by mutual aid societies, to membership in which societies priests may be invited and urged, but not compelled, as in the decree there is no mention of compulsion. For the latter, the charitable provision is made that they be sent to a religious house or monastery, to give them an opportunity of effacing the past and regaining their spiritual life and vigor.

The chapter on the "Virtuous Life of the Clergy" does little more than repeat the decrees of 1867. The wearing of the Roman collar is enjoined. There is added a prohibition to attend horse-races or the theatre. A priest must not carry into court a case, though only temporal matters are in question and the defendant is a layman, unless it is impossible to settle the case otherwise. They must not sue for pew-rents or other moneys owing to a church, unless with the previous permission of the bishop in writing. The same written permission must be obtained whenever they summon before the civil court a brother-priest or cleric about temporal matters. And it shall be the duty of the bishop to spare no effort to settle the matter by compromise, by laying it before his consultants or before the vestrymen of the church, if the case admit of it. The old law of ecclesiastical immunities still lives in the hearts of the Christian people, and even though we know it never can be revived, we are bound to respect its spirit. Over matters of Church discipline, and where Church authority is concerned, a priest who attempts to hinder directly or indirectly the exercise of such

authority by recourse to secular tribunals, incurs a special excommunication reserved to the Roman Pontiff. This is set down as a warning not for priests only, but for laymen also. For not only is the priest excommunicated, but likewise all who in any way aid or abet him in his wicked course (*ejus mandata procurantes, edentes, aut auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstantes*).

The Regulars, or Religious Orders, are next considered, and their exemptions duly set forth. Precautions are taken lest Sisters should go about begging at all times and in all places, to the scandal of the faithful, and to their own possible spiritual detriment. In some parts of the country this had become such an intolerable abuse, that it needed to be checked with an iron hand. In the same spirit, No. 295 of Title IX. enacts penalties against clerical beggars from foreign parts, both secular and religious, who come with worthless credentials or with no papers at all, not a few of them *vagabonds* in every sense of the word, very many of them a source of scandal to clergy and people by their persistent begging, in the teeth of episcopal prohibition. European bishops, who, after due warning, refuse to recall these troublers of another's household, are to be denounced to the Holy See.

In the Title of "Divine Worship," we have, first, the determining of those holydays that are to be kept as of obligation everywhere. Out of nine, we lose three; in New Orleans and its dependencies, two have been superadded to their former four; in California, Oregon and New Mexico, from fourteen, they have been reduced to six. It was necessary to make some sacrifice to obtain the advantage of uniformity, and, though some may regret the loss of the 25th of March, Annunciation Day, they can redouble their fervor by prefixing a Novena or Triduum, and holding high festival in their hearts at Mass and Communion of the day; and, what will be most pleasing to God, humbly acquiescing in the thought that their ecclesiastical superiors have not uprooted old traditional practices with reckless hand for the sake of novelty, but have acted wisely and well for God's glory and the good of souls. As to fasting, the difference of climate, the lack, in many places, of food suitable to one who keeps the abstinence, the physical needs of the laboring classes, and other considerations make it nearly impossible to attain anything like uniformity in this vast country of ours. Whatever uniformity is attainable, must be local to a great extent, limited to a few conterminous States, and agreed on in Provincial Councils.

The Christian observance of the Sunday is recommended and warmly urged by the Council. The hearing of Mass, abstinence from all servile works, and exercises of piety and devotion must sanctify the day. There is no harm in innocent recreation, for this

is allowed by the Church, to whom Christianity owes the institution of the Lord's Day, or rather its being chosen to take the place of the abolished Jewish Sabbath. But this recreation must be, in every respect, *innocent*. It must not include amusements nor places of resort in which there is danger of sin. Many who kept themselves undefiled by sin during a week of hard work, fall under the power of the devil by frequenting bar-rooms and saloons on Sunday. The warning of the Council applies principally to two classes,—those who have emigrated hither from Continental Europe, Catholic and Protestant. In the former, infidels rule, who hate God and His Church, and whatever Catholics esteem sacred; in the latter other infidels, who allow themselves to be called Protestant, but look on Sunday as a day of rest from material work. Catholics who come from either place, have been taught by government influence to hate the Lord's Day, or to make light of it. We must do our best to teach them differently. The other class is that of some of our young men, born in the Church, but brought up in the godless schools, where children too often learn to despise the authority of the Catholic Church.

In the Chapter on Marriage, the faithful are reminded that, since no authority on earth can dissolve the marriage bond, it is sinful to appeal to any civil court for divorce, and sinful in a far higher degree to attempt marriage on the plea of having obtained such falsely-named divorce. They incur, *ipso facto*, excommunication, reserved to the Ordinary. Neither may they, without first consulting the ecclesiastical authorities, apply to a civil court for partial separation, viz.: *à mensa et thoro*. Catholics who, in any State or Territory, outside of their own diocese, shall presume to call on the minister of any sect to perform the religious ceremony of marriage, are excommunicated, and cannot be relieved of this censure except by some bishop, or priest by him specially delegated. If he commit the offence in his own diocese, he must be absolved by his own Ordinary, or by another bishop, provided the application be not made *in fraudem legis* (i.e., with intent to elude the law). In those parts of the country (with the exception of the Province of Santa Fé) where the decree *Tametsi*, or the legislation of Trent, making the presence of the parish priest necessary for the validity of marriage, is in vigor, and it is uncertain whether they enjoy the benefit of the Benedictine Declaration or not, such, for example, as Galveston, San Antonio, Brownsville, and their dependencies, the Holy See extends to them likewise by positive enactment, the aforesaid declaration (p. cviii).

Titles V. and VI. treat of the clerical training in seminaries and the instruction of youth in colleges, academies, parochial and mixed schools. Seminaries are, wherever it is possible, to be of two

kinds,—the small or preparatory seminary, and the greater, or seminary properly so-called. In both, the full course is of six years (Nos. 145, 166), so that the full curriculum of studies for the priesthood will be twelve years. Of these, the last four years are devoted to theology, the seventh and eighth to philosophy. In the lesser seminary, the study of American history and the perfect mastery of the English tongue are warmly inculcated. A knowledge of Latin is also made obligatory, not such as is generally picked up in schools and reckoned sufficient by most professional men of the world, but such as will enable them to think and converse in Latin. This, far from being impossible, is not as difficult as many imagine. Students must, also, familiarize themselves with some modern language, such as French, German, Spanish, Italian, Polish, etc., which may be of service on the missions of the diocese to which they belong. In seminaries that have no villa or country-place of their own for summer vacation, the students, should they return to their homes, should be under the immediate supervision of their parish-priest, whose duty it is made to watch over them carefully and continually. All newly-ordained priests, that they may preserve the habit of study acquired in the seminary, must be examined, at least once a year for five years, by the bishop, or his representative, and the examiners of the clergy in various branches of study, viz.: Canon Law, Scripture, Theology, Ecclesiastical History, etc. This is an excellent law, and, if faithfully carried out, will be of immense advantage.

Parochial schools must be founded in every parish, where it is possible to do so. No one must attend those public schools in which the faith of children is endangered or compromised by sectarian teaching or practices. The ordinary common schools may be frequented, whenever there is good reason to do so, of which reason the bishop is the proper judge. When this is allowed by competent authority, let no one, layman or ecclesiastic of high or low degree, presume to condemn or denounce such action, much less to make it a pretext for repelling the children or their parents from the sacraments. Such presumption is no sign of orthodoxy, or strict morality; it is a direct insult to Church authority, and, above all, to the Holy See, which has spoken its mind plainly enough. (See § 198, p. 104.) Parochial schools must be under the supervision of a school board or diocesan committee of examiners, consisting of priests appointed by the bishop *ad beneplacitum*, who shall have power to examine all those, male and female, lay persons or members of diocesan religious congregations, who apply for the position of teachers in these schools. Those who are found worthy shall receive a diploma from the board, which will hold for any diocese in the country. No one, lacking this diploma,

can be employed in future by any priest who has charge of a school. At the end of five years, they must undergo another examination, which will be final. Those who fail in the examination once or twice, must be put off for the examination that will take place in the following year. We firmly believe that this is one of the most important steps yet taken to secure the efficiency of the parochial schools.

Title VII. "On Christian Doctrine" instructs clergy and laity on several points, preaching, prayer-books, catechisms, books, newspapers, etc. The most important of these regulations are: there must be a sermon on Sundays and festivals, if possible, at every mass, even low masses, though it do not exceed five minutes, duration; one Catechism must be provided for the whole country, translated (when necessary) into various languages. No one is allowed to read bad books against religion or good morals, on the poor plea that the laws of Roman congregations have not been promulgated in this country. Though the letter of these laws were unknown here, yet we are bound by their spirit. The publication of Catholic newspapers is also recommended, and in each province it is advised that one paper should be under the fostering care of the Bishop, and be entitled to receive the encouragement and support of both clergy and laity.

Title VIII. "On Zeal for Salvation of Souls" earnestly commends to all the care of immigrants when they first land upon our shores, and pastoral solicitude for the souls of the Indians and of the colored race. Stated times are assigned in which collections are to be taken up for their benefit. As regards the colored people at the South, their Catholic fellow-citizens, clergy and laity, do their duty fully and faithfully, throwing behind them all memory of the rancorous, revengeful spirit that brought about the present legislation, designed rather to injure the white than to benefit the colored population. As to the Indians, the Archbishop of Baltimore and four bishops, selected by those prelates who have Indians under their jurisdiction, will take charge of their spiritual interests, in so far as they may be influenced by Government action in the appointment of Indian agents and religious teachers by "our paternal government." They will continue to use their best efforts to undo the last traces of the anti-Catholic policy of Hiram Ulysses Grant and his spiritual adviser, Rev. Mr. Newman, who without scruple sent out Methodist agents and missionaries to rob Catholic Indians of their supplies and their religion. So deeply was the principle of this evil practice rooted in the minds of Washington statesmen, that very soon after a Cabinet minister told one of our bishops that the Washington Government was not bound to respect the religious predilections of Indians, and that they must take from the Government their religious notions as well as their blankets

and other supplies. The name of this base functionary is well known, and will be duly handed down to later generations.

This same Title in its third chapter discusses societies of various kinds, lawful, unlawful and Temperance societies. Lawful societies are to be encouraged and membership recommended. Societies that are evidently bad, as Free-Masons, Odd-Fellows, Socialistic and Revolutionist Clubs, are under the ban of the Church; and he who joins, imperils his soul, or, not in a few cases, actually hands it over to the keeping of the Prince of Darkness. Societies of doubtful character must not be condemned by name by any individual in authority, but inquired into and examined by a committee, consisting of all the archbishops of the country. Temperance societies are a great blessing, when they are truly Catholic, having for their ground-work the form and substance of pious sodalities or confraternities, in which good resolutions are prompted by Catholic faith, helped by assiduous prayer, and maintained by the fervent use of the sacraments. Otherwise they fall into the power of artful demagogues, headstrong men, rebellious to the Church, not caring for the observance of the Decalogue, nor afraid of the other six deadly sins, but priding themselves on their outward works, and especially their abstinence from drink, which can no more save their souls than could pompous fasting save the Pharisees who hated Christ our Lord and Saviour.

The next Title treats of the temporalities of the Church and how they are to be managed by bishops, priests and lay-trustees or vestrymen in their respective spheres. None of them can alienate church property which they administer; the bishop only to a limited extent and with permission of the Holy See. Lay-trustees must be proposed by the pastor, when elected by the congregation, and must be approved by the bishop in writing. They are to be presided over by the pastor, whose consent is necessary to make valid their deliberations.

An important chapter is the Fifth, which handles a very timely subject, "the raising of church money by improper means." The collecting of money at church doors for entering to hear mass is condemned as a shameful abuse, which ought to have been done away with years ago, when Pius IX. condemned it and ordered its discontinuance. The Fathers of the Council were so reluctant to admit the existence of such shameful disobedience to the earnestly expressed will of the great Pontiff, that they only spoke of the practice as a possible contingency, "*Praxis, sicubi forte existat*," "The practice, if *perchance* it yet survive anywhere," etc. We were delighted to learn, and we hope the news may be true, that the last vestige of this detestable usage has disappeared, and

that entrance to the Church and her Sacred Mysteries is now perfectly free, without let or hindrance, in all our large cities.

Further, a free space is to be left in the Church for those who are too poor to contribute. But it must be so arranged that the stigma of "pauperism" (an anti-Catholic term of reproach, wholly unknown to the true Church of Christ) shall not attach to any one enjoying the benefit of this free area for worship. There are no "paupers" in the Catholic Church. This ugly word came into our language with the "Reformation," which destroyed Christian charity and mercy to the poor, as all the "Reformers" confessed, Lutherans and Anglicans alike, with wonderful unanimity. But true Christianity forbids us to do aught that has even the semblance of dishonoring the poor (James ii., 6) or making them blush for the condition in which our Heavenly Father has placed them. St. John Baptist de Rossi, lately canonized, had the true spirit of the Founder of Christianity, for he could not bear to speak of the poor himself, nor allow others to do it in his presence, without softening their name with the tender Italian diminutive of "I poverelli di Cristo," "the poor little ones of Christ."

Picnics, excursions, and like amusements for raising church or benevolent funds are too often occasions of sin and danger, especially in our large Northern cities. In the South, and in some country places of the West, where the congregation goes out in a body, under the guidance of the pastor, and without any disturbing element from outside, they are genuine sources of happy, innocent recreation, and the money derived from such parties or excursions has upon it no taint of sin. But in large cities, or their neighborhood, too much caution cannot be observed in removing all occasions of sin. Hence they can only be held by special leave of the bishop, never at night, nor on Sundays or festivals, and forbidding the use of wine, beer or intoxicating liquors. Fairs, too, are subject to the same restrictions. Balls, with dancing and banquets, for pious purposes, in which the Devil puts on the garb of religion or, as the poet says, dresses himself up "in his Sunday's best," we never heard of before, but they must exist in some of our large Northern cities, for the Council has heard of them and stamped them with its seal of reprobation.

There are two other abuses, which were condemned by the Council of 1866, but which nevertheless continue to be as faithfully kept up as if they were binding laws of Holy Church which it were a sin to neglect. The first is, that priests come down from the altar to beg during the celebration of Mass. This is "a most shameful abuse," to use the language of both Councils, "that makes Catholics blush and awakens a feeling of mockery and contempt amongst outsiders." The other is the advertising in circulars,

by religious bodies, of Masses to be said for contributors to certain alleged pious purposes. Bishops are bound in conscience to see that such scandals are removed from before the eyes of the faithful.

The next Title (on Ecclesiastical Trials) has no general interest, since it only lays down the order and mode of procedure in the case of clerics summoned before the bishop's court, or Ecclesiastical Tribunal. Whenever a bishop's court cannot be immediately organized, Rome will dispense as long as the difficulty lasts. Meanwhile the bishop must follow the tenor of the instruction of July 20th, 1878, with its subsequent explanation, without losing sight of the spirit of the latest instruction, which is printed on p. 287. The Holy See not only desires that justice be done; but in cases of appeal wishes further to know on *what* grounds, on what *acta et probata*, a decision has been rendered, and such knowledge would be sufficient to knock on the head most of those appeals that for several years back have been floating backward and forward, shadow-like, without shape, color or substance, between Rome and this country, puzzling alternately both sides and even finding their way to our secular tribunals.

In the Title XI. on "Ecclesiastical Burial" the law of 1865 has been mitigated to this extent, that Catholics who not only possessed lots in non-Catholic cemeteries before 1853, but also those who have acquired one *bona fide* after that year, may be buried in it, and have their burial service performed with Catholic rites, either at home or in the church, unless the bishop forbid it for special reasons.

The provisions of the Third Plenary Council, though we have not been able to dwell on them as fully as we should wish, are replete with wisdom and prudent foresight; and if carried out in the same wise and zealous spirit in which they were conceived, will be of immense benefit to the Catholic Church of this country. They have been deservedly praised and commended by the American secular press, and even by a few of the so-called religious papers. But these few are the exception. The rest with one voice condemn or cavil at every thing, even the most undeniably charitable and wholesome provisions. The chapters on fallen priests, on temperance, on divorce, furnish matter for sneering and calumny, instead of commendation. These are the men who kindly pat on the back French atheists, and see little or no harm in their attempts to root the idea of God out of the mind and heart of France, as long as they persecute the Church and her ministers. Some Protestant ministers have had the good sense and courage to protest against this disgraceful mode of warfare, but their protests have been unheeded. Prophecy must be fulfilled; and the daily life of the Church has been foreshadowed centuries ago in that of

her Divine Founder. Our Saviour was compelled day after day to expostulate with His enemies, to appeal to their honesty and reason, to ask them calmly if they had any good argument wherewith to convict Him of sinful life or false teaching. "*Quis ex vobis arguet me de peccato?*"¹ And how did they answer this dispassionate appeal? With reviling and blasphemy. *Samaritanus es tu et demonium habes.* "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." Our religious editors would do well to consider what an unholy pattern they have set up (unconsciously, we trust) for imitation.

THE CHURCH AND CREMATION.

Cremation and Other Modes of Sepulture. By R. E. Williams, A.M.
 "Omnes homines terra et cinis," Ecclesiasticus, xvii., 31. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1884. 12mo.

WE were just on the point of making the above mentioned book, sent us by a friend for perusal, a peg on which to hang some observations on the attitude of the Church to the modern theory of cremation, when we received the following letter from one of our readers in Buffalo, N. Y., which will answer our purpose as well. Whether the writer be Catholic or Protestant, does not appear from the letter itself. But it makes no difference; and in either case we accord him the same impartial hearing.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

DEAR SIR:

I take it that your REVIEW sets forth the tendency of the best thought of the Catholic Church in this country. Even by its enemies it must be conceded that the belief of the Catholic Church is eminently logical and consistent and that its deductions are, for the most part, drawn with common sense. As a believer in the expediency of cremation, I am sorry to see any tendency on the part of the Church to commit itself to opposing this sensible reform.

With the first part of Dr. Brann's article on cremation in your October issue, I have nothing to do. It simply sets forth the belief, not only of Catholics but of all Christian people, that the human body, even in death, is a sacred thing and should be the object of tender and solemn respect. That in the process of cremation the body itself

¹ John viii., 46.

is subjected to any indignity, is no more true than that it is degraded by the process of inhumation.

The objection that cremation would interfere with the resurrection of the body has been so often and so thoroughly refuted, that it scarcely needs the repetition of the old and often stated argument which almost casts ridicule on the man who takes this position. The simple question, "Is it any more of a miracle for the Divine Power to resurrect the body from the ashes which are the result of cremation, than to resurrect the body from the dust which is the result of inhumation?" seems to me most thoroughly to dispose of this question. It would seem that the anxiety with early Christians to be inhumated, to which Dr. Brann refers, showed less faith in the power of God than does the belief of the modern Christian, that so far as the day of judgment is concerned, it matters little what is the present disposition of his material body.

When the learned Doctor argues against the sanitary conditions of cremation, he shows that he has not thoroughly investigated his subject. He prefaces his plea for inhumation by the condition, "if proper precautions are taken." The unfortunate fact is, that proper precautions are hardly ever taken. In most large cities in America very little fault is to be found with the location of cemeteries in their effect on water supply and other channels of infection, but in small towns little if any care is shown in this particular, and even where the utmost care is taken as to location, both in cities and towns, the other conditions which make inhumation harmless, are seldom given the scrutiny their importance deserves.

But I had not meant to combat or attempt to combat the Doctor's reasoning. Long ago abler pens than mine have furnished thorough refutation for every argument he advances. I had only meant to ask that those who represent the most advanced thought in the Catholic Church should hold their hands until the public at large has gained a little more thorough understanding of the subject, and until its more general adoption shall render patent to the many what is well known to the few, that there is nothing objectionable to the most religious mind in the modern practice of cremation. Ere long the Catholic Church will speak officially on the subject, and its utterance will be the result of that mature thought which characterizes all its decrees. That the actual practice of cremation, modified to suit the liturgy and ritual of the Catholic Church, with crematories consecrated to its service, with the final deposit of ashes taking the place of the final deposit of the body, whether in tomb or in grave, I have no doubt the decision of the Church will be that a good Catholic may let his views as a good citizen, wishing the good of his fellow-men, permit him to direct that his mortal remains shall be disposed of by the cleanly and innocuous process of cremation, and do this excellent thing with the full sanction of his Church.

I am, with all respect,

Yours,

JAMES S. METCALFE.

With the general tenor of Mr. M.'s letter we can have no fault to find. There is, however, at the close of its third paragraph, a statement which cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. "The anxiety of the early Christians to be inhumated to which Dr. Brann refers" would seem, in the opinion of Mr. Metcalfe, to argue "less faith in the power of God than does the belief of the modern Christian that, so far as the day of judgment is concerned, it matters little what is the present disposition of his material body."

Now this misconception, on the part of Mr. Metcalfe, would seem due to the fact that the writer of the article in the October number of the *QUARTERLY*, though quoting correctly enough the substance of what is found in Eusebius, has introduced it by words some-

what ambiguous, and which, to some extent, do not allow the reader to see the exact value of the quotation from the Greek historian. "Eusebius (Hist. Eccles., v. 1)," says the writer, "gives a reason for the Christian aversion to cremation which still holds good, because 'they (the Pagans) did this (cremate) to show that they could conquer God and destroy the resurrection of the bodies, saying, now let us see if they will arise.'"

This passage offers ground for a few remarks. In the first place, Eusebius does not pretend to give any reason why Christians are on principle opposed to cremation. Secondly, it is not Eusebius who speaks at all. The language occurs in an old and valuable document which Eusebius, like a faithful historian, has transcribed *ad literam*. He considered it so precious because of its antiquity and because written by eye witnesses, and so edifying in its style that he preferred to give it whole and entire to posterity rather than condense the narrative in words of his own. It is the letter of the Church of Lyons and Vienne to their brethren in Asia and Phrygia, one of the most precious and touching monuments, as a Protestant historian¹ remarks, that has come down to us from Christian antiquity.² The authors of the letter, who write with the sanction and in the name of the Church, were those who waited upon the holy martyrs Vettius, Blandina, Pothinus (bishop of Lyons), Attalus, and a host of others, and were eye-witnesses of the torments they endured from the hour of their arrest to that of their martyrdom.

Now, what say these writers? They do not put forth opinions nor give reasons of any kind about the practice of inhumation or cremation or other form of burial; they merely deal with the facts of which they had been witnesses. Naturally they mourn over their unavailing efforts to rescue or ransom for burial the limbs of some of the martyrs, thrown to be devoured by the dogs of the street. But with such jealous, malignant care were these remains watched by the Pagan soldiery, that the shades of night could not aid their pious purpose; nor could fervent entreaties, nor the proffer of gold move to pity those wicked men, as if they counted it great gain to prevent the burial of those holy relics.

"Nos gravissimo interim dolore premebatur quod humare cada-

¹ Joseph Scaliger.

² It may be found in the edition of Eusebius by Valesius, Paris, 1687, and in the 1st chapter of Book V., where a Latin translation accompanies the Greek original. This is not the best edition of Eusebius, but it is the only one to which the writer has access. The same document is given, but only in a Latin version, by Ruinart in his *Acta Martyrum*, Verona, 1731. The ordinary reader will find its substance in Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, in his account of St. Pothinus (June 2). St Irenæus was his successor in the See of Lyons.

vera¹ nobis non liceret nam neque noctis tenebræ nos juvare, neque auri vis flectere neque preces ullæ animos eorum commovere potuerunt; sed omni studio atque industria cadavera custodiebant, quasi ingens lucrum facturi, si sepultura caruissent.”²

But why did these clients of the holy martyrs so ardently wish to recover their sacred remains? It was not only to rescue them from profanation and give them due honor of Christian sepulture, but to rejoice with holy joy in the possession and safe-keeping of those venerable relics, which they counted “a priceless treasure,” “surpassing in worth all fine gold and costly gems.”³ They were, besides, moved to just indignation when they saw the ashes of the martyrs, which they longed to possess, cast into the rapid waters of the Rhone, that all hope of their recovery might be lost. And, what heightened their indignation, was the blasphemous reason alleged by the persecutors for so doing. “They acted thus,” says the Lyonnese letter, “as if they were superior (in power) to God, and could deprive them (the martyrs) of their resurrection, saying forsooth: All hope of their rising again has vanished; let us see if their God by His help can bring them again to life and deliver them out of our hands.” Here is Ruinart’s version of the original Greek, which we have not literally translated, but faithfully condensed:

“Igitur martyrum corpora postquam omni genere contumeliæ traducta et sub dio per sex dies exposita jacuerunt, tandem cremata atque in cineres redacta in præterfluentis Rhodani alveum sparsa sunt ab impiis, ne ullæ deinceps eorum reliquiæ in terris superessent. Atque id agebant prorsus, quasi Deo superiores esse et resurrectionem illis adimere possent; ut, quemadmodum ipsi dicebant, ne spes quidem ulla resurgendi eis relinqueretur. . . . Videamus nunc an sint resurrecturi, et utrum adesse ipsis Deus solus ac de manibus nostris ipsos eripere valeat.”⁴

One, therefore, may be reasonably astonished how any one could see in this document of Eusebius any “reason” or principle on which the early Christians refused to adopt or follow the practice of cremation. All that can be legitimately deduced from the above, or similar individual cases, is that the primitive Christians objected to the burning of their martyrs by the Pagan enemy, who thus robbed them of “inestimable treasures,” and to this robbery added

¹ This is a generic term, comprising the “membra partim laniata, partim ambusta,” and the “capita cum ipsis corporum truncis” of which the writer speaks a few lines before.

² Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, ed. cit., p. 59.

³ “Θησαυρός ἀτιμητος.” “Τα τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίου,” Ruinart, op. cit., in Act. Pass. St. Ignatii, p. 19; S. Polycarpi, p. 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 59, § 16.

the impious, blasphemous intent of thereby making it impossible for the Almighty Power to raise them with whole bodies on the last day. And we may confidently ask Mr. Metcalfe where, in all these accounts, can he detect a shadow of proof, or even of suspicion, that the faith of the early Christians in God's power was less strong than that of the Christians of our own day. Or in what century did the horror aroused in a Christian breast by hearing the blasphemous denial of God's attributes first begin to be held by the tribunal of history as constructive acquiescence in the truth of the blasphemy?

We have in the Acts of the martyrs very many instances where these champions of the Faith, when threatened with death by fire, which would destroy all hope of their resurrection in the body, would only smile at the impotent threat and say nothing, while waiting with calm joy their final sentence. Others would indignantly rebuke the blaspheming judge, and warn him that the God whom the Christians worshipped was Almighty, and that no power in the world, either visible or invisible, could thwart His will or make void His promises. Of one¹ it is recorded that, when condemned to the flames, after a short prayer, with the air of an inspired prophet of Israel, and in words as far above the ordinary fashion of human speech as the heavens are above the earth, declared himself willing and anxious to be cast into the devouring flames as a proof of the final resurrection.²

Coming now to note specially another point of Mr. M.'s letter, it is evident that he honestly believes cremation to be necessary for public health. Should this be demonstrated in such way that public opinion will have to yield to the evidence, there is little doubt that the Church will find no difficulty in accommodating

¹ St. Pionius, priest of Smyrna. *Vid.* Ruinart, *Acta SS. Pionii et Socior.* *op. cit.*, p. 120.

² *Haec me ducit causa, haec me potissimum ratio compellit ad mortem, ut populus omnis intelligat resurrectionem futuram esse post mortem. Ibid.*, p. 127.

See also Evodius, Assemani, "*Acta Martyrum Orientalium et Occidentalium.*" Rome, 1748, 2 vols. in one, 4to. The confidence of the martyrs in the resurrection of their bodies, even when consumed by fire, is expressed so often that it would be hard to select from such a mass of testimony. It is enough to refer the reader to the word *Resurrectio* in the indices of both volumes.

Speaking of the Acts of St. Pionius, there is extant in them a testimony to the substantiality of the Father and the Son, which, we regret to see, is seldom, if ever, quoted in theological courses. St. Pionius and St. Theodota had already confessed their belief in the "Supreme God, creator of heaven and earth." St. Asclepiades, being called on immediately after, and asked in whom he believed, replied, "In Christ." "What! (asked Polemon, the judge) Is that another God?" "No (said Asclepiades); He is the same whom they have just now confessed." This unstudied utterance shows the habitual thought of the Christian people in the century that preceded the Council of Nice, and in one sense is more valuable than a passage from a professed controversial writer.

herself to the practice. She has adhered to inhumation because when she appeared on earth she found it the received usage of God's chosen people, to whose inheritance she had succeeded, and her Divine Founder had condescended to be entombed in the earth. Had she found, when she came into the world, the practice of cremation prevalent everywhere, she would have made it her own. She did not find any Divine command to the contrary; for the passages that are often cited as such (Gen. xv., 15, and Deut. xxi., 23) do not exactly command burial in the earth, but rather presuppose it as an existing usage. She would have adopted it, as she did so many other practices of the Pagan world, purifying it first from every vestige of Pagan contamination. She would have framed her Ritual accordingly, and drawn many a fitting reflection from the upward tendency of the flame, the dross-consuming, purifying influence of fire, etc.

But is this necessity of cremation demonstrated *ad evidentiam*? Mr. Metcalfe thinks so; but there are not a few physicians and scientists, both inside and outside of the Church, who think very differently. Some even in our country go to the length of asserting that it might prove dangerous and become a source of infection. We do not pretend to decide the question; but it looks hard to suggest any action by the Church, positive or negative, until the question is decided. It was the mistake of Galileo, who insisted that the Church should explain the Scriptures in accordance with his new theory. But Cardinal Bellarmine very properly told him that this could not be done as long as it was a mere theory. It would be time enough when the theory had reached the point of demonstration.

Another reflection, and we have done. The Church has little faith in the good intentions of the men who are urging the theory and practice of cremation. In the mind of Mr. M. and a few like him there reigns no un-Christian sentiment, but a *bona fide* scientific opinion, whether well-founded or not matters little. But these are only the few. The great army of cremationists in Europe is made up of Atheists and infidels, professed enemies of God and His revelation. It is clear enough that, though some of them advance scientific pretexts for their purpose, most of them argue on irreligious grounds, and re-echo the spirit, if not the words, of the Pagan crowds who burnt the martyrs. Could the Church be supposed to listen with any confidence or respect to such men and their theories? And of some men of doubtful faith amongst ourselves it may well be asked: If they are so intent upon benefiting the public and averting infection, why is it that they have ever on their lips cremation, and cremation only? Why is it that they do not champion the cause of pure water and good drainage. The

water men drink in our big cities is an abomination. Drainage was perfectly understood two thousand years ago and more;¹ it is now one of the lost arts. Bad water and bad drainage are daily slaying thousands. Where is the loud cry of our benevolent philosophers?

We entertain well-grounded fears that the day will come when cremation will be forced upon unwilling peoples by law. It will begin in Europe, where the worst elements of society are fast growing into power. It will not be done with the benevolent view of providing for public health, though this pretence may be put forward. Or perhaps they may be cynical enough to incorporate in the law their true motives, just as the French Republic attempted a hundred years ago to abolish by law the immortality of the soul. As to our own country, it will be done much later, if ever; though we are filled with misgivings, when we remember what has happened within the last forty years. One thing is certain. Should cremation ever be made compulsory by the civil power, the Church will yield obedience to the law, and adapt her prayers and funeral rites to the new method of incineration. So we are distinctly told on high authority, that of Professor Sanguinetti, in his "Institutes of Canon Law" (*Cap. De Sepulturis*) printed at Rome (with ecclesiastical *imprimatur*) no later than two years ago, in 1884.

¹ Cf. Card. Wiseman's Essay entitled, *Sense vs. Science*.

Scientific Chronicle.

SCIENTISTS AMONG THE CLERGY.

IN our last issue we referred to the words of Cardinal Pitra in which he urges that the Catholic priesthood should number in its ranks specialists in the various branches of science. In this connection, a word might be said of the relation borne to science by the clergy of the present time. The custom of maligning the Catholic Church as the opponent of scientific progress has not altogether passed out of fashion among the enemies of Catholicity. Now it would be an interesting study to take up the history of the march of science and see how many Catholics, and especially how many Catholic priests, have been in the van.

We must not forget, moreover, that it is in spite of a world of unavoidable impediments that a Catholic priest must labor in this line of work. Scientific study requires leisure. Yet of necessity how little leisure does a priest enjoy! Many are the duties of his sacred ministry that tax his days and often call for much of the night. When to this is added—as is sometimes the case—the task of teaching, which usually exacts considerable preparation, it will be seen that the time remaining for deeper study or original research is at best but a trifle. Besides, it is not usual for a priest to have at his command the costly instruments necessary for even the simplest work in some of the natural sciences, and often, too, he is without means to meet the expenses essential to experiments of an original kind. Notwithstanding, there has been a great deal of valuable work done by such men. Yet the world receives very little information thereof. To an observant reader of scientific journals it is evident that there is not a little exclusiveness among some of the magnates in scientific circles. They may be unconscious of it. But it is there: and one daily sees meagre results from the labor of one of their own set explained to the full and praised as of the highest character, while noble work from other hands is ignored.

True, there is not so much forwardness among religious workers. But neither is there—generally speaking—among truly great scientists; nor should the editor of a scientific journal suffer the clamors of those who lay claim to a prominence to which they have no title, deafen his ears to the modest voice of one whose work speaks for itself. Yet on glancing carelessly here and there at a few numbers of the scientific periodicals, “*Science*,” “*Nature*” and “*The American Journal of Science*” of the past two or three years, we met with a few eminent names, which, fancying they will prove of interest, we shall here briefly review. Be it understood, however, that it is a random choice and prominent men may be passed unnoticed; but we do not by mentioning some to the ex-

clusion of others wish to establish a comparison. Our only object is to name—and that solely from the sources aforesaid—a few of those who are a credit to the Catholic clergy, in the hope that some other may one day undertake a thorough discussion of the topic.

In "Nature" for December 17th, 1885, is published a letter from Father Denza, containing a thoroughly digested report of the shower of meteors on the night of November 27th. The letter is in French and, though rather long, is printed in full, showing that its contents are deemed of value. Father Denza is a Barnabite, Director of the Observatory of Moncalieri at Turin, and President of the Italian Meteorological Association. He was lately sent to France to represent Italy at the Meteorological Congress held at Paris. Some of the results of his observations on the star-shower will be found in this chronicle.

In connection with meteorology another name of note appears. In "Nature" for November 5th, 1885, is given a brief review of a pamphlet on the meteorology of China, published by Father Dechevrens, S. J. Father Dechevrens is at the head of the Zi-ka-wei Observatory near Shanghai, and his work there has frequently received favorable notice in scientific papers. He was at one time sent to Europe at the expense of the Board of Trade of Shanghai to secure suitable instruments for the observatory. He has published a book on the "Typhoons of the Chinese Seas," which has received well-merited attention.

This question of meteorology is absorbing continual interest of late, owing to its value to commerce and the shipping in general. Observers, especially those connected with the U. S. Signal Service, have had so large a percentage of their weather predictions verified that they have been encouraged to push their observations to a further perfection. This will account for the fact that, of late, men whose reputation is founded on work of a much higher order are brought into public notice more frequently on account of meteorological contributions. Thus in "Nature" for July 30th, 1885, the editor acknowledges the receipt from Stonyhurst College Observatory of the "Meteorological Report for 1884," by Rev. S. J. Perry, S. J., F. R. S., and adds that "the work done at this observatory becomes more and more valuable every year." Father Perry was twice sent out by the Royal Observatory at the head of the expedition to observe the transit of Venus. At the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Philadelphia in August, 1884, he read a paper before the Astronomical Section that was received with the highest favor. He has published a number of valuable scientific articles, chiefly on questions connected with astronomy.

Also in "Nature," for March 13th, 1884, Professor Milne of Japan has an interesting paper on earth-tremors, wherein he is not sparing of his praise of Father Bertelli of Florence, whom he acknowledges as "the father of the science of microseismology." For observing passing tremors he recommends the tromometer, an instrument invented by Father Bertelli and Professor Rossi, which he describes at length. Father Bertelli has given himself assiduously to this branch of study for a number of years

past, and "since 1870 has made many thousands of observations" connected therewith.

In the same paper mention is incidentally made by Professor Milne of Father Faura, S.J., who has become noted for his study of typhoons. At the Observatory of Manila, in the Philippine Islands, he has had admirable opportunities for storm-observations, which he has turned to good account. In "Science" for February 7th, 1883, is printed in full the result of a series of his observations made during the typhoon of October 20th, 1882, at Manila, together with the diagrams showing the several maxima and minima of the items in the report.

In the Spring of 1885 Canon Carnoy, of the University of Louvain, published a work on "Cellular Biology," which was taken up by Professor Martin, the Professor of Biology at the Johns-Hopkins University in Baltimore, who published a review of it in "Science" for April 17th, 1885. He was generous in his praise of it, and took occasion therefrom to call attention to this practical refutation of the statement that the Catholic Church and science are at war.

Also in "Science" for September 18th, 1885, is noticed Lieutenant Dyer's translation, "Practical Hints in Relation to West Indian Hurricanes," of which Father Viñes, S.J., Director of the Observatory of the "Colegio de Belen" at Havana, is the author. Some years ago the substance of the same pamphlet was translated in Ferrel's "Meteorological Researches for the Use of the Coast Pilot," in the Coast Survey reports. This, together with the fact that the present version is issued from the Hydrographic Office, goes to show what importance is attached to Father Viñes' conclusions.

In "Science" for February 5th, 1886, is a notice of the death of Father Gaetano Chierici, late Director of the Museum of Antiquities at Reggio. A movement is on foot to place a bust of him in the museum which he so long directed. His specialty was prehistoric archæology, and he has become famous for his study of the Terremares of Æmilia, where his investigations have established the existence of a prehistoric age of bronze.

Going back to the issue of "The American Journal of Science" for April, 1883, we find a notice of the first of a series of "Memoirs on the Natural History of the Chinese Empire." It is on "Trionyx," and written by Father M. Heude, S.J. Father Heude has discovered in China many new species of shells, hitherto unstudied, and has lately been enabled to erect a museum there in which to preserve the collections he has made of these and many other interesting specimens in the several branches of Natural History.

The published results of the work done at the Washburn Observatory, Ann Arbor, Michigan, are reviewed in "Science" for November 20th, 1885. The reviewer has a few words of praise for Father Hagen, S.J., in company with Professor Holden, now of the Lick Observatory in California, which may here be quoted: "The fifth part of the volume is a 'Catalogue of 1001 southern stars for 1850.0, from observations by Signor P. Tacchini at Palermo, in the years 1867, 1868, 1869,' by Rev.

Father Hagen, S J., and Edward S. Holden. The original observations had never been reduced to mean place ; but being good ones, and in a part of the sky where needed, we have here the anomaly of European work reduced and republished in this country ; and Father Hagen and Professor Holden are to be highly commended for making it available."

In the same issue of "Science" a merited encomium is passed upon an invention which the Abbé Rougerie of Pamiers, in France, recently brought before the French Academy of Sciences. It is an artificial miniature of the earth, and so arranged that when rapidly rotated it indicates the origin, direction, and interference of the air-currents of our globe. So far it has worked with admirable success, having faithfully reproduced the dominant winds of both hemispheres.

In "Nature" for October 8th, 1885, we found a few words of comment on the Abbé Renard of Belgium. They were in reference to a part of that work which has given him his fame, the arrangement and discussion of the specimens gathered by the "Challenger" in her voyage for deep-sea soundings. His name is well-known in Europe, especially in connection with geological and lithological studies.

Lastly, in the number of "Science" just issued—March 12th, 1886—a brief abstract is given of an essay read before the Geographical Society of Saguenay by the Abbé La Flamme, of the Laval University at Quebec. The paper touches on both the geography and geology of that district, and its contents are of no mean importance.

Before we close we may call attention to the merits of the late Abbé Moigno, editor of "Cosmos" and "Les Mondes," two journals devoted to the interests of science and by no means unknown to scientists abroad. He has published a number of works of merit on scientific subjects.

Nor would this little catalogue be complete without reference to the remarkable work done by the Jesuit Fathers Joubert in mathematics and Secchi in astronomy. Father Ferrari, S.J., who has endeavored to continue Father Secchi's work, has been deprived by the Italian Government of the instruments which the munificence of the Popes and the industry of his predecessor had set up in the Observatory of the Roman College. His place at the Observatory is filled by a secular professor, the appointee of the Government, so that his work is now confined to the meteorological observations which the few instruments at his disposal have placed within his reach. He still publishes the old "Bollettino" of the Roman College, at present, following the fortunes of its editor, reduced to a meteorological record.

In conclusion we have to recall that in a late number of "Nature" high praise was given to the geographical researches of two Catholic missionaries, who, in the scant moments left them from the many and arduous duties of their calling, found leisure to draft an atlas of China, which, it seems, is superior to any that has yet appeared.

The observatories, too, which are at present in the hands of the clergy, notably those of Calcutta, Kalocsa in Hungary, Malta, and Santiago in Chili, as well as those we have incidentally mentioned in the course of

this review, give promise of bringing Catholic priests into prominence as scientific workers.

ASTRONOMY.

THE METEORIC SHOWER OF NOVEMBER 27TH, 1885.

THOSE who follow the scientific movements of the day are aware that on the 27th of last November astronomers all over the world were on the watch for the repetition of the star-shower of the same day in 1872. It had been predicted in Lord Crawford's "Dun Echt Circular;" most of the scientific papers had forewarned their readers that it would take place, and on November 23d a paper was read by Mr. Lanker before the Paris Academy of Sciences on "The Shower of Meteors that may accompany the Transit of the Earth through the Descending Node of Biela's Comet on November 27th." Nor had science made a mistake. Early in the evening of November 27th the obedient meteors moved into the atmosphere of the earth, and a brilliant display of celestial fireworks was witnessed throughout Europe and Asia. In this country it had almost ceased before sunset, so that observations could be taken only on the latter and less interesting portions of the shower. The observers of Europe and Asia were more favored. Wherever there was a clear sky clusters of stars could be seen bursting forth in all directions from a point in Andromeda, traversing with slow and steady motion paths seldom exceeding an arc of 20° ; then suddenly disappearing and leaving behind them tracks of light of reddish or bluish-white color. In the beginning of the display many of the meteors were equal to Venus in brightness. Throughout, the field of radiation, according to observations made at Greenwich, Princeton, and elsewhere, was an oval region about 4° long N. and S., and 2° wide, and its centre about 2° N. W. of γ Andromeda. The number of meteors that fell has been variously estimated—the most reliable calculation, made by Fr. Denza, places the number at 150,000. Be this as it may, a comparison of the different accounts in scientific journals will show that the shower of last November was inferior, neither in duration nor in the brightness and the multitude of its meteors, to the remarkable display of 1872. From among these many accounts it may be of interest to quote the following extract from a letter of Fr. Denza to the Paris Academy:

"The spectacle presented to our eyes during the first two hours, when the shower was at its maximum, was wonderful, and almost baffles description. From all parts of the heavens myriads of stars were rained down, as though a nebulous cloud were dissolving. They were followed by luminous tracks, and many surpassed in brilliancy stars of the first magnitude. Their progress was generally slow; their predominant color red, produced, no doubt, by the numerous vapors scattered through the atmosphere. The tracks of those meteors near the radiant point were very short; many, in accordance with the law of perspective, were merely bright points. Most of them fell from the same radiant region

as that of the meteor shower of 1872—between Perseus, Cassiopea, and Andromeda. No secondary centre of radiation was seen, as ordinarily is the case on the nights of greater displays.”

All this stellar pyrotechny is of great importance in the eyes of the astronomer, for it brings to his mind fresh proof of the correctness of the theory connecting these displays with comets. These latter wanderers are frequent visitors in that portion of space where the Divine Hand has traced the pathway of our little earth. Even at present there are two, nightly visible in the telescope—Barnard’s comet, and one discovered at Paris on December 1st, 1885, by Fabry. According to Dr. Oppenheim (Paris) they will be distinctly visible to the naked eye in northern latitudes about the middle of April or the first of May. Now, some of these comets that cross the earth’s orbit are supposed to throw off large masses of matter. This matter may be in the state of gas, or may be a collection of finely divided particles of a solid substance. It is immaterial for our purpose which—it is enough for us that it separates into a number of small bodies revolving in the same orbit as when they were a part of the original mass. The earth as it wheels around its orbit will at some point cross the pathway of the comet. Let us suppose that these stray pieces of the comet are dashing past the crossing point at the same time; they will then come in contact with our atmosphere. Before this contact they are invisible by reason of their smallness, but upon entering our atmosphere they rub against the particles of the air—an enormous heat is generated—the pieces of the comet become brilliantly lighted up—a bright star shoots across the sky. If they are small they vaporize at once, and disappear forever. If they are large enough, or of such a matter as to withstand the heat generated by their motion through the air, they drop to the earth as aerolites. If on any particular occasion they break forth in great numbers from one point of the heavens, we have a star-shower, such as was witnessed on November 27th.

On this theory can be readily explained the brilliant meteoric displays of November 12th–13th. After a long series of investigations by Professor Newton of Yale, and others, it was concluded that they were caused by the earth’s encountering a swarm of meteoroids following in the wake of a telescopic comet discovered by Tempel at Marseilles in December, 1865. A similar connection was shown by Schiaparelli to exist between the August meteor-showers and the second comet of 1862.

In the case before us we have a further and very striking proof of this connection. But with what comet are we to connect these meteors of November 27th? The astronomer, searching through the history of heavenly bodies, answers at once—with Biela’s comet. What are the reasons that lead him to this conclusion? Let us first say a word or two in regard to the history of this comet. Taking its name from Biela, an Austrian astronomer, who was the first to calculate its orbit, in 1826, it was found to have been observed in 1805, and earlier still in 1772. Its period of revolution was fixed at about six years and six months. However, its next observed visit to the region of the earth was delayed till

the November of 1845. In the following January it was found to have suffered an accident unheard of in the history of its brother comets. It split into two unequal parts, and thus divided sailed off into space. In 1852 it showed itself again, but about September of that year disappeared. Since then eager astronomers have kept up the watch for it during each of its returning periods. It has never reappeared, but on the night of November 27th, 1872, and again during last November, a remarkable stream of meteors was found wandering around the deserted orbit of the comet. Here, then, we build up our reasons for asserting the connection of this star-shower with Biela's comet. First, this stream of meteors exhibits a perfect orbital resemblance to the comet; secondly, the time of the occurrence of this shower is found to be exactly that in which the earth is at the crossing-point of the two orbits, and it is witnessed only in those years when, according to computation, the comet should be somewhere in the vicinity of this crossing-point; and lastly, the radiant point in Andromeda from which the meteors diverge corresponds most accurately to that from which fragments of the comet, moving in the orbit of the original mass, would seem to come. All this can scarcely be the result of mere chance, and weighing well the many facts presented to us, we can reasonably conclude, though not with absolute certainty, that these splendid meteoric displays of November 27th are caused by the burning in the earth's atmosphere of a swarm of meteoroids—remnants of the departed glory of Biela's comet.

CELESTIAL PHOTOGRAPHY.

When, in 1840, Dr. Draper, of New York, succeeded in photographing the Moon, few astronomers even suspected that before the century's close the camera would play such an important rôle in the observatory. In the "Month" for last December Rev. Fr. Perry, S. J., with his wonted thoroughness, gives a view of the camera's applications, past and present, in the celestial science. But so rapid is the progress, and so widespread the good results obtained in this line, that since the publication of Fr. Perry's article some very important achievements have been made public. Among these is the discovery by photography of a new nebula in the Pleiades.

The new nebula, as first photographed on November 16th by MM. Henry at Paris, has a very well marked spiral form, and seems just to escape Maia. Since then it has been photographed several times, but only very lately has it been seen with the great Pulkowa Refractor; and thus we have another instance proving, as had already been done for the stars, that light can fix on a photographic plate the images of objects which can scarcely be seen, even with the largest telescopes. Nor is this the only advantage of photography when applied to the nebulae. It is chiefly valuable for its detailed accuracy in furnishing the only trustworthy criterion of change in those strange bodies. For, as all know, it is especially in the details that artists fail in reproducing the exact shape of the nebulae. Even the least source of information regarding

their forms is welcome, as they constitute so important a link in La Place's theory.

In the November meeting of our Academy of Science at Albany, Prof. E. C. Pickering, referring to the recent progress in celestial photography, made the following remarks: "The first stellar photographs ever taken were those of α Lyræ, by the elder Bond at the Harvard Observatory in 1850. In 1857 his son carried similar investigations much further. At first they had been unable to obtain clear images of stars of the second magnitude, while now it is possible to print those of the fourteenth, or, in other words, to transfer to paper an image produced by an object only a hundred-thousandth part as bright as formerly." He then goes on to expose the three different fields of investigation opened—first, that of mapping the heavens; second, that of studying stellar spectra; and finally, the determination of the amount of atmospheric absorption.

With regard to the first of these points, we may remark that a project is already on foot to obtain the co-operation of astronomers of different nations, many of whom are interested in this new work. They should all follow the same method, and portion out among themselves the heavens. One of Professor Pickering's aims is to further this project, so that before the close of the 19th century we may have a map of the universe with stars down to the fourteenth magnitude, all stamped in their true relative position. This, indeed, would be an arduous undertaking, and utterly to be despaired of did we rely on the artist, for the labor of an hour by the new process would cost the draughtsman months of toil.

The foregoing presents but a small portion of the work done by astronomical photography, in which great progress has been made during the past few years. Want of space prevents us from dwelling at present upon other applications of the same process, to the determination of the connection between magnetic storms and the sun-spots and faculæ; to the reproduction of the exact appearance of the planets, especially of Venus at the moment of its transits, and to the mapping of the lines—the Fraunhofer lines—of the solar spectrum, which has been so successfully and exactly done by the Rowland's gratings. We may return to this subject at an early opportunity.

PHYSICS.

ELECTRICITY.

OF the many recent discoveries and researches made in this ever-increasing branch of science we will mention a few of more general interest.

As stated in most daily papers, Mr. Edison has very lately made, on the Staten Island Railway, several successful experiments of his system of inductive telegraphy. The idea is not new. A few years ago similar

successful attempts were made on the New York Central Railway with the Phelps system. This system, however, requires a specially laid wire between the tracks, while Mr. Edison uses the ordinary telegraph wires stretched along the road. We shall endeavor to explain, even without diagrams, the Edison method. The apparatus used, both on the train and at the fixed stations, consists of an ordinary Morse key, a vibrating reed, an induction coil and a battery, for sending the dispatches; and, for receiving them, of a phonetic receiver or telephone. The principle involved in this method is that of electric influence or induction. Whenever a current begins or ceases to traverse a wire, it produces an instantaneous current in a neighboring wire. This action is called induction. It is well known that if the telephone wires are strung close to the telegraph wires, the dispatches passing through the latter can be more or less easily heard. This fact, which in ordinary cases is an inconvenience, is ingeniously utilized by Edison in his new system for receiving dispatches, while similar currents are made use of for sending them.

Suppose a dispatch is to be sent. The two extremities of the secondary wire of the induction coil are respectively connected, one with the ground through the car-wheels, the other with the tin roof of all the cars of the train. In the circuit of the primary wire with the battery the Morse key is introduced, and also a vibrating reed, which is made to vibrate five hundred times a second by means of a small independent battery. The ordinary Morse alphabet is used. When the operator lowers the key, not one but many interrupted discharges pass through the primary wire. These are reproduced in the secondary wire, and are changed into currents of high tension, or potential, as they are technically called. These currents pass unto the car roofs, from which they affect the telegraph wires stretched along the road. If a phonetic receiver or telephone is interposed in the circuit of the line wire, an operator, at any fixed station, perceives the dots and dashes produced by the key on the train that sends the telegram.

At the fixed stations a similar apparatus sends induction-currents on the telegraph wires; the high potential currents passing through them affect the roofs of the moving cars. The induction currents communicated to the tin roofs pass through a phonetic receiver or telephone, and thus enable the operator on the car to perceive the dots and dashes of the key that transmits the message.

The system, which has been successfully tried, is on the point of being introduced on some railroads. As its expenses are very small, and its usefulness recognized on all sides, it will perhaps be adopted by most of the railroads of the country.

We take pleasure in announcing the fact that Mr. J. A. Maloney, of Washington, D. C., has quite recently patented a reversible telegraph key. There can be no doubt that this key, when more generally known, will prove to be of the greatest utility to telegraph operators. According to the method heretofore made use of, the operators when obliged to work for hours in succession oftentimes endured extreme fatigue, and not unfrequently became afflicted with what is called "operator's paralysis,"

brought about by the constant up and down motion of the hand pressed upon the key whilst sending the message. Now the very ingenious contrivance of Mr. Maloney has for its purpose to remedy this evil. In Mr. Maloney's invention, by a simple arrangement of a screw, the operator may in a few seconds cause the key to play from side to side, instead of the up and down movement. This change has proved to be a very great relief, so much so that persons already afflicted with the paralysis are enabled, by using this system, to continue their occupation. In a test case to which the recent invention was subjected, it was found that a person very badly afflicted with this paralysis, and who in the ordinary way could work the key but for a very few moments, was able to use the reversed one for hours without experiencing the slightest inconvenience.

Lately two authoritative reports have fallen into our hands which seem to settle that very practical question as to the relative merits and advantages of the electric light and other methods of illumination. Knowing as we do how often persons desirous of informing themselves on this subject are confronted with very questionable statements of parties interested in the one method or the other, we feel all the more inclined to place before our readers a summary of these reports, deeming them worthy of all reliance.

The recent experiment of the Franklin Institute upon incandescent and arc-lights, gives the following averages: one pound of anthracite, burned under a good boiler, yields in the incandescent system of lighting about 40 candles for an hour; the same weight of coal gives from the naked arc-light about 158 candles; as, however, the arc-lights are generally shaded, the intensity is so far diminished that it scarcely reaches 80 candles per pound. One pound of bituminous coal will yield from 5 to 6 feet of illuminating gas. This gas, in the argand burner, will yield from 14 to 17 candles. Illuminating gas is burned at once in the simplest manner, and the amount of machinery and care required by electric lighting offsets its greatest economy of fuel, light for light.

From the report of Trinity House, in England, on the inquiry into the relative merits of electricity, gas, and oil, the general conclusions arrived at by the committee were these: that the "electric light, as exhibited in the experimental tower of South Foreland, has proved to be the most powerful light under all conditions of weather, and to have the greatest penetrative power in fog"; and that for all practical purposes the gas and oil were equal. "For the ordinary necessities of light-house illumination mineral oil is the most suitable and economical illuminant, and that for salient headlands, important land-falls, and places where a very powerful light is required, electricity offers the greatest advantages."

Book Notices.

THE LIFE OF THE VERY REV. THOMAS N. BURKE, O.P. By *William J. Fitzpatrick, F.S.A.*, author of "The Life, Times and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin," "Ireland Before the Union," etc. London: C. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.; New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

To some it may seem both strange and unfortunate that it should have been left to a layman to write the life of Father Burke. Yet, when all the circumstances are considered, it may be deemed fortunate that the Irish Dominican Father, who purposed undertaking the work, relinquished the idea. For, as the Right Rev. Bishop of Galway said, when unable to take the chair in furtherance of a memorial, that, "as Father Burke's mission was primarily with the laity," there was a special fitness in a layman taking the lead to perpetuate his memory.

The author has spared no pains in gathering information from reliable sources, not only in Ireland and England, but also from Rome and the United States, in all of which countries Father Burke's name has become a household word. He acknowledges himself under special obligations to the Provincial of the Irish Dominicans, to the Provincial of the English Dominicans, and to Major Haverty, of New York, for very valuable assistance.

In his preface, the author defends himself against the charge which he anticipates that some persons will make, that too much space has been given to portraying Father Burke as a humorist, and not enough to exhibiting him as a preacher whose sermons earned for him so high a reputation. From our first glance over the work, we thought the charge well founded. But, on a careful perusal of it, we became convinced that the author's treatment of his subject was correct and judicious. For, to suppress mention of Father Burke's irrepressible humor would be to destroy his individuality, as much so as to ignore his great and characteristic humility. The two, indeed, were inseparably interwoven, and the former was very often employed as a cloak to hide the latter. Then, too, Father Burke's sermons are familiar to all, but his inexhaustible fund of pleasant humor and ridicule, which were oftenest directed against himself and to his own intentional disparagement, are less well known, except to those who were in frequent and familiar intercourse with him. But there was also another side of Father Burke's life of which the world knew nothing—his wonderful interior life of fervent piety and profound devotion, in depicting which the author says he has been greatly aided by those who knew him best as priest, as monk, as conductor of retreats, and as discharging the duties of the various offices he held in the religious order of which he was a member.

The account of Father Burke's boyhood and youth is very detailed, and clearly traces the development during that period of his life of the characteristics which subsequently made him so distinguished. Widely as Father Burke was known as an eloquent preacher, there was much of his character and life of which the public knew nothing. It is quite commonly supposed that he owed his oratorical power entirely to his natural genius; that he owed what knowledge he possessed to an extraordinary memory which retained whatever he picked up by desultory

reading, but that he was neither an industrious student nor an accurate scholar. Yet this was a very erroneous impression. Father Burke was not a laborious student, in the common sense of the word, nor was he an extensive reader; but the studies he made were thoroughly mastered, and their principles and fundamental ideas grew and bore an abundance of rare and ripe fruit in the rich and deep soil of his extraordinary intellect. He knew St. Thomas Aquinas by heart. His questions and his method of analyzing and treating them, his objections and answers and arguments, were all at Father Burke's fingers' ends. At first thought, this seems strange. For, as regards the outward form in which they respectively discussed subjects and put their thoughts, there appears to be no similarity whatever between St. Thomas Aquinas and Father Burke. Yet this dissimilarity is in form and appearance only.

Father Burke understood too thoroughly the nature of his mission as a preacher, the character of the audiences he addressed, and the manner in which he could most effectually reach them and hold them, to employ scholastic forms and methods in his sermons or lectures. Yet his familiarity with those methods, and his habitual, and perhaps unconscious, use of them in gathering and arranging his ideas, formed, we believe, the secret of his wonderful quickness in preparing his discourses, and, indeed, in delivering, as he often did, seemingly without any previous thought or reflection, discourses which were masterpieces of overpowering eloquence. As St. Thomas would develop a whole treatise from a single axiomatic truth, so Father Burke would develop a sermon or a lecture from a single pregnant thought. The thought grew in his mind as he proceeded in his discourse. It put forth boughs and branches, and these clothed themselves with foliage and fruit, as does a tree under the influence of genial warmth and moisture.

But, to us, the most interesting part of Father Burke's life, and the one which is saddest, yet at the same time most glorious, is its latter part. For ten years before his death he was tortured with an excruciatingly painful disease. But, though his physical strength was waning and his body was tortured with pain, his intellectual power was undiminished, and his zeal and devotion to his mission as a preacher of the truth shone forth all the more brightly. Unsparing of self, devoted to his special work, he complied with every call that was made upon him, regardless of the physical suffering it caused him.

One of the brightest Christian virtues of Father Burke was his profound humility. Yet even this he concealed under a veil of seeming carelessness and indifference. His jocularities were often employed as a means for enduring and for momentarily forgetting the bodily pains with which he was tortured; and very often, too, he carried it to the extent of seeming frivolity in order to diminish the esteem in which he was deservedly held, and to prevent his election to offices of high ecclesiastical dignity.

To preach his last sermon, which was for the relief of poor starving children in Donegal, he dragged his pain-racked body from his cell at Tallaght, and travelled long and weary miles, that the board of those famished children might not be bare when he lay buried. The Dominican Brother who accompanied him feared that he would die on the road. Speaking of him on this occasion, Chief-Justice O'Hagan says: "Who that was present can forget the closing scene, when, with bent and broken form and faltering footstep, he ascended the pulpit to plead the cause of the starving children? Never in the brightest days of his career were his utterances more tender and impressive. But every lineament told of coming dissolution. He gathered together what remains

of life and fire were left within him to do this last act of charity and pity."

The work before us, from which we have gleaned these remarks, is a worthy tribute to the memory of the illustrious Father Thomas N. Burke, O.P.

THE SPIRITS OF DARKNESS AND THEIR MANIFESTATIONS ON EARTH: Or Ancient and Modern Spiritualism. By *John Gmeiner*, Professor in the Theological Seminary at St. Francis, Milwaukee Co., Wisconsin. Milwaukee and Chicago: Hoffmann Brothers, Catholic Publishers. 1886.

The popular way of accounting for the phenomena of Spiritism and the performances of persons who claim and profess to be mediums of spirits, is that all their manifestations are mere deceptions, similar to those performed by experts at tricks of sleight of hand. It is an easy method of explaining away these manifestations, and satisfies careless observers and superficial thinkers, and also the class of skeptics who are commonly called Agnostics. It receives seeming confirmation, too, from the fact that in many instances pretended spiritualistic mediums have been proven to be arrant impostors, and their deceptive methods and machinery have been detected and exposed. Owing to these facts, a large number of persons, and prominently among them distinguished materialistic scientists, have hastily concluded that all spiritualistic manifestations are mere tricks and delusive phenomena, and that there are no such real manifestations.

The mistake of those who thus reason is that their conclusion is broader than the facts from which they derive it. The fact that *some* pretended spiritualistic manifestations have been proven to be frauds is not a logical reason for believing that *all* of them are frauds. Yet such is the conclusion of many persons who, without serious thought, are inclined to disbelieve in the reality of spiritism.

Still another class of persons deny the possibility of such manifestations, because of their disbelief in all spiritual existence. They are *materialists*; they resolve all manifestations of being and existence into the action of mere material forces. According to them, our thoughts, our volitions, are nothing else than effects of these forces acting under certain conditions; man has no mind nor will, in the proper sense of those words; he has no soul; and all spiritual existences and God Himself are mere figments of the human imagination. Scientists who grovel in and are ruled by these false and impious notions, are compelled by logical consistency to explain away and entirely deny the reality of all spiritualistic manifestations, without regard to the overwhelming evidence of actuality with which they are, sometimes, accompanied and proved.

But, however strenuously these resolvers of all things into the sole action of material forces strive to deny alike the existence of God, of angels, of the human soul, and of the devil and the spirits of darkness, yet facts and logic, and reason, and Divine Revelation are too strong for them. In addition to the testimony of human consciousness, of the metaphysical arguments which prove the existence of the human soul, of angels and of God; in addition to the silent but eloquent testimony of the earth and the heavens, the spirits of darkness come forth at times from their abodes of torment and bear unintended, unwilling testimony to the same truths.

As regards this, *modern* spiritism has a somewhat like relation to the truth that the testimony of devils in the days of our Blessed Redeemer's

sojourn on earth, bore to the reality of His mission. They had no love for Him or for truth. Yet, against their own wicked wills their testimony was in favor of the truth.

These thoughts of our own, though suggested by an examination of Father Gmeiner's work, will furnish a clew to its general purpose as defined in the preface. His particular object is to "defend certain Christian doctrines against two classes of opponents," first, "against Materialists who, like the Sadducees of old, believe neither in angels nor devils; and secondly, against modern Spiritualists, who imagine that . . . a new revelation from the Unseen Above, superior to Christianity and destined to supersede it, has dawned upon mankind."

The author also modestly expresses the hope that "many a skeptically inclined Christian" may learn from a perusal of his treatise "that evil spirits really do exist among men; . . . that demoniacal possessions and apparitions . . . are by no means only products of the imagination; and that the exorcisms, the use of the Sign of the Cross, and of the Name of Jesus, and other means sanctioned by the Church to protect ourselves against 'the snares of the devil,' are by no means ridiculous or superstitious practices, as many enlightened people in this country are inclined to think."

Then, too, as the author suggests, the student of history will find many a fact and suggestion that will assist him in better understanding some of the most mysterious parts of human history, such as the oracles among ancient heathen nations, "the origin of false religions, the strange supermundane apparitions occasionally recorded, even by very sober historians," etc. Those, too, who are concerned about modern "spiritualism," "mind-reading," "thought-transference," "mind-cure," "psychometry," "hypnotism," "mesmerism," etc., will find in the volume before us many facts which will not only interest him, but go far towards explaining them.

INSTITUTIONES MORALES ALPHONSIANÆ: seu Doctoris Ecclesiæ S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Ligorio Doctrina Moralis ad usum Scholarum accomodata, cura et studio P. Clementis Marc, Congreg. SSmi Redemptoris. Romæ: Ex. Typographia Pacis, Philippi Cuygiani. 1885. Two vols. Large 8vo. Vol. i., pp. xvi-911. Vol. ii., pp. 837.

The aim of Father Marc in undertaking this laborious and excellent compilation was, as he himself tells the reader, to develop accurately and clothe with scientific form the entire moral system of St. Alphonsus, which lay scattered in several distinct works, and in so many and varied editions of his "Moral Theology." To render himself competent for the task, he not only devoted years of assiduous study to the published writings of the Saint, but also made careful use of what providentially fell into his hands—a great number of notes and letters on moral subjects which lay hidden, unknown and unpublished for nearly a whole century after the Saint's death. He declares that these letters have enabled him to throw light upon several points, which were not explained clearly enough (*non ita perspicue expositæ*) in the "Moral Theology" of St. Alphonsus.

Some theologians prefer to follow the method of St. Thomas, who, in treating of the natural law and its obligations, arranges the latter under the head of the various virtues and the connection by which they are logically held together. Our author, however, adheres to the order of St. Alphonsus, and modern theologians generally, who treat of these

duties and obligations according to their relative dignity and importance, in which they have for guide the Decalogue itself. Yet, not to neglect altogether the method of the angelic doctor, which is more scientific, he follows the usual practice of most theologians of later date, and towards the end of what may be called general "Moral Theology," gives a treatise *De Virtutibus in Genere*, which serves as a stepping-stone to what is known as special "Moral Theology." Indeed, as the author well remarks, the proper place for such a treatise should be, not after, but before that *De Peccatis*, since duty or obligation is, in the logical order, prior to breach or transgression of the same.

The author, in his preface, states that he has treated at some length and (he adds) with careful investigation, the whole subject of Probabilism, with a view to establish with certainty what he calls the "Moral System of the Holy Doctor, Alphonsus." This, as was to be expected, he stoutly maintains to have been no other than Equiprobabilism.¹ But his reasoning, we fear, acute as it is, will not convince all readers. It has not convinced many learned clergymen, religious and secular, who have reviewed his work. We have no wish to argue the point, even if our space allowed such discussion. We will merely say that, in default of every other reason, reverence alone for the great Saint would incline us to the contrary opinion. If any one wishes to hear the arguments on the other side, he can find a brief but lucid statement of them in F. Aloysius Sabetti's excellent "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis," printed at Woodstock, Maryland, in 1884 (pp. 51-57). Besides, the whole difficulty in reality seems to be more speculative than practical. And we feel sure that, in administering the Sacrament of Penance, the children of St. Ignatius and the disciples of St. Alphonsus—as they have in view the same end, the glory of God and the salvation of souls—follow pretty much the same grand rule, derived from priority of right, or, as it is called, possession. *Melior est conditio possidentis*. It would be well if some one would translate into Latin, for the general use of students of Moral Theology, Gianvincenzo Bolgeni's admirable book, entitled, "Il Possesso, Principio fondamentale per decidere i Casi Morali," reprinted at Rome, in 1847, by Monaldini.

F. Marc's work, besides being clearly written, and containing many wholesome practical hints for pastors and confessors, makes the reader acquainted with many provisions of the civil law in Germany, France, etc., which may be very useful to the theological student, not only in Europe, but likewise in this country.

Apart from its learning and clearness of style, F. Marc's book would be worthy of commendation on the score alone that it gives the student a fair digest of the opinions of St. Alphonsus on doubtful moral questions. The Saint's writings are not infallible, and any one, who feels so inclined, may take, for his guides, Toletus, Suarez, De Lugo and others, whom the Saint himself venerated as classical theologians of the first rank. But there is this legitimate prejudice in favor of St. Alphonsus, that the Holy See, while passively allowing a confessor to trust to the guidance of those illustrious theologians, has declared him to be safe in adhering to the opinions of St. Alphonsus. Hence, it was not without reason that Cardinal Sanfelice, the present archbishop of Naples, declared officially in his diocesan Synod, four years ago: "Experientia teste, ille confessarius uberiores fructus colliget, qui in confessionario sententiis et praxi Ligorianæ propius accesserit." (Synod. Dioce. Neapol., Jun., 1882.)

¹ Equiprobabilismus.

THE THIRTY YEARS: Our Lord's Infancy and Hidden Life. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

This volume completes the first part of Father Coleridge's admirable work entitled "The Life of Our Lord," of which a number of volumes on subsequent periods of the Life of our Blessed Redeemer have already appeared.

It has often been a matter of wonder to those who have attentively studied the writings of the holy Evangelists, how little is said by them respecting these thirty years of our Divine Lord's existence on earth. Yet while this fact may well excite devout astonishment, it also furnishes convincing proof of the truth that the revelations of God to us are to be "measured not by the multitude of words in which they are conveyed, but by the importance of the matters of which they speak." Of this we have a most frequent and convincing example in the method adopted by our Lord Himself. In the course of His teaching, He laid down His doctrines concerning most vital points in His work in the fewest possible words, as when He spoke of the Blessed Sacrament, the Adorable Sacrifice, the Priesthood, the Power of Absolution, and the like. In similar manner the Holy Evangelists have been guided by Divine inspiration to a silence, or, when they do speak, to a brevity on the subjects treated of in this volume, and in others on other like subjects, which may remind us of the extreme fewness of our Divine Lord's own words, and of the wonderful pregnancy of the few words which the Holy Evangelists have recorded as spoken by Him.

These remarks apply directly and most fully to that most wonderful portion of our Lord's sojourn on earth commonly called "His Hidden Life."

"It is with regard to that long period," says Father Coleridge, "that we are most tempted to let our human and inadequate ideas of the virtue and power of the interior life of prayer and communion with God for the carrying on of His work in the world, make us feel impatient of what seems inaction at a time when action was, according to poor human judgments, most needed." We forget that even in His Public Ministry there were periods of retirement and silence,—at all events periods of which little account has been given,—and of which we know and have no means of knowing scarcely anything. Then, too, if we study the Lives of the Saints, which are a practical commentary on the Life of our Lord, we shall find but very few, even of the most active workers and preachers among them, who have not had their activity thus broken up. "The most fruitful activity in the sight of God is the activity of prayer."

But while the accounts of our Divine Lord's "Hidden Life" on earth are few and brief, yet, if devoutly studied and pondered over, they are deeply significant and pregnant with spiritual instruction. As we learn the great dignity of the Apostles from the manner in which our Lord gave Himself up to their training at the very time that He was in the midst of His Public Ministry, so, too, we may learn in the same way the importance in His sight of bringing to the utmost perfection the magnificent work of God in the souls of Mary and Joseph, from the length of time during which this was His chief and chosen occupation. The external course of the Hidden Life at Nazareth, too, says Father Coleridge, "was probably as uniform and same as is that of the lives of good religious in some peaceful house of prayer and contemplation." Then, too, there are analogies between the Life at Nazareth and the various phases and conditions of the common life of Christians,

which, if carefully studied, furnish an immense treasure of spiritual instruction.

In pursuance of these ideas, Father Coleridge devotes the volume before us to a careful examination of what the Sacred Scriptures record respecting this period of our Blessed Redeemer's existence on earth. The Nativity of our Lord, the apparition of the angels to the shepherds, our Lord in the crib, the Circumcision, the canticle of Simeon, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the holy innocents, the return from Egypt, the Hidden Life at Nazareth, our Lord at Jerusalem, His subjection and growth, the death of St. Joseph, and other subjects involved in the thirty years' life of our Blessed Redeemer before He entered upon His Public Ministry, are carefully and profoundly examined and discussed by Father Coleridge.

On some points the revered writer differs from the opinions commonly entertained, but he not only adduces strong reasons of his own in support of the conclusions at which he arrives, but gives them confirmatory strength by references to like opinions entertained by early Church Fathers and eminent theologians. The work is evidently the result of extensive research, of careful study, and of devout and profound meditation.

KING EDWARD THE SIXTH, SUPREME HEAD: An Historical Sketch, with an Introduction and Notes. By *Frederick George Lee, D.D.*, author of "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," "The Church under Queen Elizabeth," etc. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1886.

The author of this work is an Anglican clergyman, and Vicar of Lambeth. Having free access to the archives of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth, he availed himself of it to examine the letters, records, and other documents that were stowed away and buried from public knowledge, and particularly those of the times of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth. In "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," and "The Church under Queen Elizabeth," and other historical works, he published some of the results of his examination. But the exposure of the meanness, cruelty, treachery, and immorality of the leading workers in the so-called Reformation movement in England, was so damaging to the Anglican Church that further examination of the archives relating to those times was prohibited.

The work before us may be regarded as a sequel to the author's previous publications. It is a strange book for an Anglican clergyman to write—that is, for an Anglican who really believes in Anglicanism. From original letters and documents, he makes the leading men who figured most prominently in the political and religious movements of the time of Edward VI. to tell the story of their own terrible wickedness, and to paint their own portraits. And a horrible story of deceit, falsehood, perjury, selfishness, cupidity, ambition, and fanatical cruelty it is. Were it not that the men who were the founders of the Anglican Church, and whom Episcopalians professedly regard as saints, speak through their own letters and papers, it could scarcely be believed that wretches so base and corrupt, and so devoid of manly and moral principles, could care or dare to attempt to hide their vices and their crimes under the garb of piety and zeal for religion. But there are no limits to cowardice and hypocrisy, and the English "Reformers" were at once cruel tyrants and base hypocrites and cowards.

If this language seems too strong, it is only necessary to glance over the work before us and read the extracts it contains from original docu-

ments of unquestioned authenticity, showing what manner of men Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Bruce, Peter Martyr, and a host of others, all promoters of the "Reformation" in England, really were. They live again in the records of their words and deeds contained in the work before us.

In like manner the author shows the awful impiety, profanity, and coarseness of these "Reformers" and their followers.

"Believing themselves," he says, "to have become the custodians of a new and more comfortable revelation, they treated with the most impious language and the most towering contempt the religion and the sacred rites of the august and divinely-guided Church of God. Everything that lying ribaldry and misrepresentation could do in the work of destruction, and to delude and mislead the afflicted populace, was done with energy and great determination of purpose. Vile fly-leaves, false and libellous in their statements, were printed abroad, imported hither, and circulated widely; blasphemous verses, set forth in black-letter, and filthy jokes concerning the most sacred subjects, were propounded and distributed."

In like manner the author shows, from authentic official documents, the stealings and robberies, and desecration and destruction of churches, sacred shrines, convents, and hospitals, from which these "*Reformers*" enriched themselves and their followers, or against which they vented their impious malice.

The work is full of rare and valuable information, the result of examining documents, many of which are hidden away in the secret archives of Lambeth Palace.

THE PARNELL MOVEMENT; WITH A SKETCH OF IRISH PARTIES FROM 1843. By T. P. O'Connor, M.P., author of "Lord Beaconsfield, a Biography;" "Gladstone's House of Commons," etc. Authorized edition. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

The story of Ireland's struggle for long centuries against oppression and tyranny and cruel legislation, sometimes intentionally framed to impoverish and destroy her people, sometimes designed to slightly alleviate their miseries, but which, framed by an alien, often intensified the suffering they intended to lessen, has been told by many writers, each occupying a different point of view. It is scarcely possible, therefore, that any new or original information can now be produced. Still less is this the case with respect to the events which concern Ireland during the last forty-five years. These are facts of contemporaneous history within the memory almost of the present generation.

The reader of this volume could scarcely expect to find any new historical facts or fuller interpretations of them in its pages. Its value consists in the clear and concise narration of well-known events, and in its interesting biographical sketches and clear-cut, distinct word-pictures of the leading men, whose actions and influence, both for weal and for woe, contributed chiefly to shape the history of Ireland during the last forty-five years.

Indeed, as the author states at the commencement of the first chapter of his work, his "main purpose is to describe the movement which is associated with the name of Mr. Parnell." But, as he also says, "that movement cannot be understood without some acquaintance with other movements, of which it is the child and successor." For this reason he has thought it best to go back a short time and start with the year 1843.

The author's first chapter is entitled "The Fall of O'Connell," and

the animus with which it is written may be inferred from the first remark respecting O'Connell: "The Irish people," says the writer, "may be *excused* (the italics are ours) for the honor they paid to O'Connell after he had won for them Catholic Emancipation." Following this are successive chapters on "The Coming of the Famine," "The Famine," "The Great Clearances." Then follows a chapter on "The Great Betrayal," narrating the treachery of Keogh, its antecedents, concomitant events, and its resulting consequences.

Succeeding this are chapters on the utter ruin and cruel evictions which followed; on the revolutionary schemes and movements that were attempted; on Isaac Butt; on the famine of 1879; on the "Land League," and the "Coercion Struggle."

The last chapter contains an account of the last general election of members of Parliament and its results.

Interspersed in the various chapters of the work are numerous interesting biographical and personal sketches of Ireland's present leading men, drawn with a free hand. Among them, we need not say, Mr. Parnell occupies a prominent place. The value of the work is further enhanced by a number of statistical tables, and by numerous quotations from official reports and other documents, showing the actual condition of Ireland at different times, and the misery inflicted on the people by landlordism and oppressive legislation.

THE TRUTH ABOUT JOHN WYCLIF, HIS LIFE, WRITINGS AND OPINIONS: Chiefly from the Evidence of his Contemporaries. By *Rev. Joseph Stevenson, S. J.* London: Burns & Oates. 1885.

Protestants, in their desperate efforts to establish a precedent for the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, have been at great pains to apotheosize such characters as Huss and Wyclif. So anxious have they been to build their vain hopes upon the teachings of these rebels against spiritual and temporal authority that they have not even taken the trouble to study their private lives and public careers, leaving this duty to opponents who are now using it to the advantage of the true Church, and the discredit and eternal shame of schism. The task, as regards Wyclif, could have fallen into no better hands than those of Fr. Stevenson, who, in this octavo volume of a little more than two hundred pages, gives the best picture yet presented of the religious state of England in the fourteenth century. The learned Jesuit, who had already done so much to set the public mind right regarding Mary Stuart, evidently possesses the genius of the true historian.

Wyclif's recommendation is, as Father Stevenson tersely remarks, "that he rebelled against the authorities of his ecclesiastical superiors, and persisted till his death in his rebellion. If it be suggested that he died an excommunicated heretic, the fact, if recognized, seems rather to add to his reputation. If we venture to remind the admirers of his principles that these same principles in former days endangered the security of the Church and the crown, led to the murder of an Archbishop of Canterbury on Tower Hill, and deluged London with the blood of her best citizens, the intelligence makes no lasting impression. . . . Wyclif serves to keep alive, perhaps not altogether unprofitably, the flagging zeal of a certain class of believers in the great Protestant tradition. . . . We venture to remind our countrymen that they do not know much about their hero, and that the little which they do know is not altogether to his credit. He died outside the Church; he taught doctrines subversive of religion, morality, civil government

and social order; but we speak in vain. Ignorance easily gives its admiration to a noisy innovator, especially when he becomes insubordinate and uses strong language." Thus tersely does our author set forth in his preface the character of the heresiarch, and the true reason why he is held in such high honor and esteem in certain so-called "respectable" quarters. Referring again to this latter point, in connection with the Wyclif centenary, he justly says that "the men who are so hard upon us poor Catholics for commemorating the examples of God's saints, and the sufferings of God's martyrs, have now, themselves, furnished us with a sufficient answer to their own accusations. When we find them professing a veneration, at once exaggerated and unauthorized, for an individual whose errors and extravagances are much more conspicuous than his sanctity, we ask them to bear with our respect towards such men as St. Augustine, St. Anselm and St. Thomas of Canterbury, and to permit us to prefer our saints to theirs." Much more to this effect we might quote from the book before us, as well as an excellent summary of the politico-religious perturbator's unsavory career, were space at our disposal; but we take great pleasure in referring our readers to the pages of the book itself, in which they cannot fail to be absorbingly interested.

THE CAUSE OF IRELAND PLEADED BEFORE THE CIVILIZED WORLD. By *Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, L.D.* (Laval). New York: P. F. Collier, Publisher.

The motive of this book is well expressed in the following words, taken from its preface: "No one, however, on either side of the Atlantic, or on any point of either hemisphere where Irish hearts beat responsive to Ireland's fears and hopes, but must have read in the signs of the times that the crisis of her fate has come; and that, if all her sons, at home and abroad, will only be true to her NOW, and do, each, a true man's part to help her, success is as surely to be won within the next decade—perhaps, within the next year—as the sun which sets to-day will rise to-morrow." The author goes on to say that the conviction that this crisis had come in Irish affairs impelled him, after fifty-three years' absence from his native country, to revisit it, that he might see with his "own eyes the land and the people," and do what he might and could "towards helping the sacred cause at a time when every day and hour is pregnant with the fate of the Nation."

Out of this conviction and action the book before us has grown and been published. The author, first, briefly states Ireland's case,—the grounds on which the plea for justice to her is founded. He addresses this plea "to the great tribunal of public opinion, and, through it, to the conscience of all mankind." He then brings it home to Englishmen, by showing that they are, directly, deeply interested in fully knowing the wrong which they have done to Ireland.

The author then divides his work into five chief divisions or parts. In the first of these he shows what was the condition of the country and people before the English invasion. The second part he devotes to an historical exhibit of the "Land Question" in Ireland, and of the people and country under English methods of "civilizing" (?) them. Part third treats of the period of "Plantation and Extermination." Part fourth, of "Cromwell and his Atrocious Measures." Part fifth, of "The Last Long Period of Wrong" (1660-1885).

In separate chapters, and separate subdivisions, the different subjects, which these main divisions embrace, are clearly exhibited and discussed. In the concluding chapter, the manner in which "England's manifold injustice must be repaired" is pointed out. The chief points are:

Make Ireland a field of profitable labor ; reconstruct the land laws and the land courts ; coerce the landlords ; protect the tenants ; protect and encourage the fishermen, and develop the fisheries ; resuscitate Irish industry and trade ; abolish Castle rule ; RESTORE SELF-GOVERNMENT TO IRELAND.

PREPARATION FOR DEATH ; OR CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ETERNAL TRUTHS, USEFUL FOR ALL AS MEDITATIONS, AND SERVICEABLE TO PRIESTS FOR SERMONS. (Maxims of Eternity—Rule of Life.) By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis : Benziger Brothers. 1886.

This is the first volume of the "Centennial Edition" of the works of St. Alphonsus, "a new and only complete" edition of the ascetical and dogmatical treatises. The works of the Saint relating to "Moral Theology," and written by him in Latin, will remain untranslated. As regards the arrangement of matter, this English edition is based on the French translation from the Italian of Fathers Leopold Dujardin and Jules Jacques, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, published in twenty-seven volumes.

The aim of this work is two-fold : First, it is intended for the use of all persons who desire to establish themselves in virtue and to advance in spiritual life. Secondly, it furnishes a collection of matter suitable for sermons at missions and the spiritual exercises. To render it more useful for seculars, the several considerations are each divided into three points. Each point serves as one meditation, and to each of these are annexed "affections and prayers." To render the considerations more useful to preachers having but few books and little time for reading texts of Scripture and passages from the Fathers, brief, but strong and animated, maxims are added. Appended to the work is "A Christian's Rule of Life."

In view of the high place which St. Alphonsus' writings occupy in the estimation of holy doctors and theologians of the Church, and of the emphatic approvals of them by numerous Sovereign Pontiffs from Benedict XIV. to Pius IX. and Leo XIII., it would be not only gratuitous, but presumptuous, to add anything in commendation of this excellent work.

SADLIER'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, ALMANAC AND ORDO FOR THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1886. With full Official Reports of all Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures, etc., in the United States, Canada, British West Indies, Ireland, England, and Scotland. New York and Montreal : D. & J. Sadlier & Co.

HOFFMANN'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY AND CLERGY-LIST QUARTERLY, 1886. Milwaukee and Chicago : Hoffmann Brothers, Catholic Book Publishers.

An annual Catholic "Directory" of the Dioceses, Churches, Clergy, etc., in the United States, with ecclesiastical statistics as full and accurate as possible, is almost indispensably requisite to bishops and clergy of the Catholic Church in the United States. As will be seen by the titles of the above named publications, there are now two of these works competing for public favor.

The volume by Sadlier & Co., which is before us, comprises, in addition to the United States, Canada, British West Indies, Ireland, England and Scotland. The volume by Hoffmann Brothers is confined to the United States. The price of Sadlier's & Co. is \$1.25 ; but they issue a fifty-cent edition also, containing only the United States portion of the work. That of Hoffmann Brothers is fifty cents. The latter-named firm also announce that they will publish, quarterly, a corrected Clergy-list, which will be sent, free of charge, to every subscriber to the Directory. The object of publishing this corrected Clergy-list is to note in

it all changes that occur during each three months, and thus make the Directory as accurate at the close of each year as at its beginning.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE ON ALGEBRA: For the Use of Beginners. By *Joseph Bayma, S. J.*, Professor of Mathematics in Santa Clara College, California. San Francisco: A. Waldteufel. 1885.

ELEMENTS OF GEOMETRY: For the Use of Beginners. By the same author, and the same publisher.

In his preface to the former of the above-named treatises, the learned author says that he has made it a point to be as plain and as brief as possible, in order that students of his treatise may look upon it as a pleasurable distraction, rather than an additional burden. In this purpose, we think, he has admirably succeeded. His definitions, rules and explanations are models of simplicity, clearness and conciseness. The examples under each rule and subject are well chosen, and sufficiently numerous to test and exercise the student's faculties.

The treatise on Geometry is condensed in like manner, because, Father Bayma says, while "comprehensive books are very useful in the hands of those whose minds are already formed, experience shows that a judicious parsimony proves more successful in encouraging the mental efforts of young beginners." The order and method which Father Bayma has adopted, and the proofs he has selected, are well calculated to save the student from unnecessary labor, and yet, at the same time, to exercise his understanding, and "foster his industry."

PRAXIS SYNODALIS. Manuale Synodi Diocesanae ac Provincialis celebrandae. Editio (altera) emendata. Neo-Eboraci: Benziger Fratres. 1886. 12 mo., pp. 96.

This valuable little book is based on the work of the celebrated Bartholomew Gavantus, bearing the same title, and which is reprinted in most editions of his "*Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum*." But it adds, what is wanting in Gavantus, the ceremonies, formularies, etc., that are needed for the celebration of a Provincial Council. These, as the compiler remarks, are taken chiefly from the Councils of Vienna, Prague and Cologne, held in the years 1858 and 1860. The first edition appeared three years ago, and was then generally supposed to be the work of the present Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. But the name of the true author, Rev. Sebastian G. Messemer, is given in this second, corrected edition. The Rev. gentleman was one of the Secretaries of the late Plenary Council, and belongs to the Diocese of Newark. One of the chief merits of this little book is the *lucidus ordo* that pervades it from beginning to end, as Archbishop Corrigan well remarks in his Introduction.

MONTH OF MAY; OR A SERIES OF MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERIES OF THE LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, AND THE PRINCIPAL TRUTHS OF SALVATION, FOR EACH DAY OF THE MONTH OF MAY. From the French of *Father Debussi, S. J.* Translated by Miss Ella McMahon. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Bros., 1886.

A SHORT AND PRACTICAL MAY DEVOTION. Compiled by *Clementinus Deymann, O.S.F.* New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

These are two most excellent books of devotion, and each has merits distinguishing it from the other. The former, which is much the larger, has, we are glad to see by the title-page, reached the fourth edition, and the latter ought to be at least equally popular. In order to meet the means of the masses it is gotten out in cheap form, in strong paper cover, but well printed on good paper. The other is also a fine specimen of bookmaking. Both bear the stamp of high episcopal authorization.

